THE Lutheran Quarterly

Volume XIII MAY, 1961 Number 2

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Managing Editor
FRED W. MEUSER
Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Columbus, Ohio

Book Editor
ARNOLD E. CARLSON
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

Circulation Manager
LOWELL J. SATRE
Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Gettysburg, Pa.

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Philadelphia, Pa.

Augustana Theological Seminary
Rock Island, Ill.

Capital University Theological Seminary
Columbus, Ohio

Wartburg Theological Seminary
Dubuque, Iowa

Luther Theological Seminary
St. Paul, Minn.

Augsburg Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Central Seminary
Fremont, Neb.

Chicago Lutheran Seminary
Maywood, Ill.

Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada
Waterloo, Ont.

Grandview Seminary
Des Moines, Iowa

Hamma Divinity School
Springfield, Ohio

Lutheran Seminary
Saskatoon, Sask.

Northwestern Lutheran Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Southern Lutheran Seminary
Columbia, S. C.

Suomi Seminary
Maywood, Ill.

Trinity Seminary
Dubuque, Iowa

Pacific Lutheran Seminary
Berkeley, Calif.

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aim:* The aim of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume XIII May, 1961 Number 2

CONTENTS

THE PROBLEM OF OLD TESTAMENT HERMENEUTICS ..... *Ronald M. Hals* 97

ALBRECHT RITSCHL AND HIS CURRENT CRITICS ..... *Philip J. Hefner* 103

AN APPRAISAL OF THE HYMN TEXTS IN THE SERVICE BOOK AND HYMNAL ..... *Benjamin Lotz* 113

THE FORMATION OF THE LUTHERAN GENERAL SYNOD, SOUTH, DURING THE CIVIL WAR ..... *Gordon W. Ward, Jr.* 132

A JOURNAL OF JOHN SAMUEL MAU, 1794-1795 ..... *Willard D. Allbeck* 155

MOVEMENT TOWARD THE MIND OF CHRIST ..... *Martin E. Lehmann* 165

CORRESPONDENCE AND COMMENT

Did Luther Advocate Feeding Faith on Christ's Testament? ..... *Edward Emmers* 173
A Reply on the Relation of Word and Sacrament in Luther ..... *William H. Lazareth* 173
The Bossey Graduate School of Ecumenical Studies ..... *H. H. Wolf* 177

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Blair, *Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew* (O. K. Storaasli) 181
Elmen, *The Restoration of Meaning to Contemporary Life* (G. W. Forell) 182
Miegge, *Christian Affirmations in a Secular Age* (G. W. Forell) 182
Ferré, *Language, Logic and God* (L. Lundeen) 183
Bainton, *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace* (D. A. Lund) 184
Dresner, *Three Paths of God and Man* (D. Belgum) 185
Telfer, *The Forgiveness of Sins* (D. Belgum) 185
White, *Soul and Psyche* (P. M. Lindberg) 186
Porter, *The Day of Light* (T. A. Kantonen) 187
Every, *The Baptismal Sacrifice* (T. A. Kantonen) 187
Fackre, *The Purpose and Work of the Ministry* (G. M. Bass) 188
Walker, *The Human Problems of the Minister* (P. M. Lindberg) 188
Hageman, *We Call This Friday Good* (G. M. Bass) 189
Reu, *Thomasius Old Testament Selections* (A. O. Arnold) 190
Berner, *Fulfill Thy Ministry* (A. O. Arnold) 190
Holt, *Handbook of Church Finance* (P. M. Lindberg) 190

CONTRIBUTORS

Ronald M. Hals is associate professor of Biblical Theology in the Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary in Columbus, Ohio.

Philip J. Hefner, a graduate of Chicago Lutheran Seminary in Maywood, Illinois, is at present engaged in graduate study in Systematic Theology in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago.

Benjamin Lotz is associate professor of Religion in Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pennsylvania.

Gordon W. Ward, Jr., a graduate of the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, is engaged in graduate study in the History of American Culture in the University of Pennsylvania.

Willard D. Allbeck is professor of Historical Theology in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.

Martin E. Lehmann was installed as professor of Historical Theology in Central Lutheran Theological Seminary, Fremont, Nebraska, in January, 1961.

Edward Emmers, III, is pastor of the Church of the Redeemer in Reading, Pennsylvania.

William H. Lazareth is assistant professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia.

H. H. Wolf is director of the Ecumenical Institute, which has its headquarters in the Chateau de Bossey, near Geneva, and is operated under the auspices of the World Council of Churches.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are Olaf K. Storaasli, professor of New Testament in Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.; George W. Forell, professor of Systematic Theology in Chicago Lutheran Seminary, Maywood, Ill.; Lyman Lundeen, graduate student in Union Theological Seminary, New York; Doniver A. Lund, professor of History in Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.; David Belgum, professor of Pastoral Theology in Northwestern Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn.; Paul M. Lindberg, professor of Christian Education in Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.; T. A. Kantonen, professor of Systematic Theology in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; George M. Bass, professor of Homiletics in Northwestern Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn.; Arthur O. Arnold, professor of Homiletics in Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.

The Problem of Old Testament Hermeneutics

By Ronald M. Hals

BROADLY and briefly put, the problem of hermeneutics is this: How does the Old Testament speak to us? As the book of the old covenant the Old Testament is addressed to the people of the old covenant, the people of Israel. But we are not Jews, nor are we even proselytes who have come secondarily to be included under that covenant. Therefore, with obvious logical necessity we conclude that the Old Testament is not addressed to us. Logic notwithstanding, we recognize the simple reality that the God who spoke to his people in the Old Testament is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and still speaks to us. The church's decision to claim the Old Testament as a part of the canon of the Christian Bible is nothing other than the recognition of this fact.

But though we all recognize that the Old Testament speaks to us, the question that remains is "how." The issue, then, is one of method. More precisely formulated, the problem of hermeneutics is: By what exegetical method can we discover that in the Old Testament which has relevance for us? To this question scholarship has been unable as yet to give a satisfactory answer. Actually the question has no single answer. For just as the question, "Why is *A* saved and *B* damned?" is illegitimate in that it contains essentially two questions, each of which must be answered separately, so the question about *the* method of hermeneutics assumes a single technique which would be applicable to all the various forms of Old Testament literature. No such master key exists. Different areas of the Old Testament require different methods.

It is difficult even to establish any basic directives which would be universally acceptable. While many hold that all valid exegesis must be strictly scientific, that is, rooted solely in human reason, others feel that some exegesis "takes place in the freedom of the Holy Spirit"

and "cannot be hermeneutically regulated,"[1] remarking that the door of revelation opens only from within. Again, while some scholars believe the exegete must be purely objective, others observe trenchantly that real theological perception is impossible apart from a personal commitment. However, all is not hopeless controversy. There does seem to be growing agreement that any meaningful interpretation of the Old Testament must do justice to the character of that book as a book of history, presenting history as wrought by God's Word[2] and the area of God's self-revelation. Frequent reference will be made to this criterion in what follows.

Against this scanty survey of the nature of the problem of hermeneutics I shall try to outline the major contributions of the recent past (approximately fifteen years) toward a solution. Virtually all recent writers maintain that the relevance of the Old Testament for us lies through its relation to the New Testament. This was perhaps said most clearly by Otto Procksch in the first sentence of his theology of the Old Testament, "All theology is Christology," meaning thereby that we know no God apart from the God who reveals himself in Jesus Christ. Implicit in this assertion is the denial of the synagogue's claim to be the legitimate continuation of the Old Testament and the affirmation of the New Testament's claim to be the further record of the saving acts, and even the ultimate act, of the God of the Old Testament.

If, then, the way to a relevant understanding of the Old Testament lies through its relation to the New, certainly the crucial issue is the determination of the nature of the relationship between the two Testaments. The major recent contributions to Old Testament hermeneutics have been made by those who formulate this relationship in terms of fulfillment.

Oddly enough, it was a New Testament scholar, Rudolf Bultmann, who was the author of the first contribution to be considered. In an article entitled "Prophecy and Fulfillment," which first appeared in *Studia Theologica* in 1948 (Vol. II, No. 1, pp. 21-44) but which may now be found in the collection of essays entitled *Vergegenwärtigung,* he attacked the issue of the relation of the Testaments first by pointing

1 Gerhard von Rad, "Typologische Auslegung des Alten Testaments," in *Evangelische Theologie,* 12. Jhrg. (Heft 1/2, 1952-53), p. 33.

2 *Ibid.,* p. 23.

ut the inadequacy of the old terminology of prediction and fulfillment, and then by attempting a new formulation of the true relationship as he saw it. It is the second section of his presentation (by far he larger part) which is of value here. Bultmann claims that the New Testament message actually constitutes the destruction (*Scheitern*) f the three basic Old Testament concepts: the covenant, the kingdom f God, and the people of God. The covenant idea is destroyed by the New Testament message of a Gospel for all men, "Jews and Greeks." The kingdom of God idea is destroyed by the New Testament message f a radically realized eschatology in the lordship of Christ. And the Old Testament concept of the people of God is destroyed by the New Testament message of the church, whose membership is determined not y birth and blood but by water and the Spirit.

What is to be said by way of evaluation of this? On the positive ide, here is a significant enrichment of the nature of what fulfillment nvolves. On the negative side, the criticisms must be made that Bultmann not only ignores the positive aspects of fulfillment, but in his urther development he also transfers the fulfillment of that self-evelation of God which originally took place in history into the timeess category of personal self-understanding.

The second major contribution in recent years to the problem of he nature of fulfillment is found in Friedrich Baumgärtel's work, specially his 1952 volume *Promise*. Baumgärtel advances the claim hat one fundamental promise underlies the entire Old Testament, namely, "I am the Lord your God." It is this promise rather than any prediction which finds fulfillment in the New Testament. However, nasmuch as the Old Testament does not contain the Christian Gospel hrough which alone the fulfillment comes, its anticipation of the fulfillment cannot be of any historically positive sort, but actually constitutes the testimony of a non-Christian religion. The only positive value, therefore, in Old Testament history is as a series of examples forming a history of piety. In criticism of this it must be said that once again history has been forsaken for a flight into spiritual principles.

The third contribution is that made by the advocates of typology, especially Hans Walter Wolff and Gerhard von Rad. The most direct statement of the case for typology is that made by Wolff in his essay

"Concerning the Hermeneutics of the Old Testament," originally appearing in *Evangelische Theologie* in 1956, but now available in an excellent collection edited by Claus Westermann under the title *Problems of Old Testament Hermeneutics*. There he points out that "only the New Testament offers a real analogy to the Old Testament's history-centered testimony of faith, . . . and this analogy in a unique historical relationship in which the follow-up transcends its anticipation is what we call typology." In the use of the typological method Wolff finds several values, especially in the way it opens up insight into the kerygmatic intention and theological perspective of a passage. In criticism of Wolff's views Wolfhart Pannenberg points out that this approach still finds no real positive significance in the events of Old Testament history, since the basic meaning is only in the over-all theological structure.[3]

The leading advocate of typology, Gerhard von Rad, has very recently, in the final one hundred pages of the newly published second volume of his Old Testament theology, advanced the case for typological fulfillment still further. Von Rad begins with the usual attitude of the Old Testament itself toward the fulfillment of promises. He shows how for the writers of the Old Testament the promises of God were never exhausted by any one fulfillment. The promise to the fathers of rest in God's promised land is fulfilled in the conquest under Joshua, and yet Israel is challenged in Deuteronomy, the prophets, and the Psalms to look to that rest which still lies ahead. Because the subject of von Rad's second volume is the theology of the prophets, he is in a position in his hermeneutical observations to demonstrate in detail how the fundamental theological standpoint of the prophets is that of offering a charismatic reinterpretation of the events of past sacred history. The message of the prophets is that of a new David, a new Exodus, a new covenant, and a new Jerusalem (p. 334). In other words, the prophets find a typological significance in the events of Israel's past history which enables them to speak relevantly about God's next act in history. It is, of course, apparent that the New Testament writers again offer such a charismatic reinterpretation of the history of the Old Testament. And it is von Rad's ultimate point that the relevance of the Old Testa-

3 W. Pannenberg, "Heilsgeschehen und Geschichte," in C. Westermann, *Probleme alttestamentlicher Hermeneutik*, p. 309.

ment for today is to be found through another such charismatic reinterpretation of a typological sort.

Now, then, on the basis of these recent contributions looking toward a solution of the problem of Old Testament hermeneutics, what consequences suggest themselves? It is, I think, apparent that the hermeneutical problem of the relationship of the two Testaments is by no means solved. In my opinion the one area which most loudly cries out for further study is the nature of fulfillment. This is a matter of concern to both Old and New Testament students. Von Rad and Bultmann have given us considerable stimulation, but there is much yet to be done. In the Old Testament von Rad is so far the only one who has worked extensively with the concept of the prophet's charismatic reinterpretation of the old in the proclamation of the new. This new work needs to be digested, evaluated, and extended. In the New Testament, speaking with that carefree freedom which only the dilettante knows, I feel that the early church's concept of fulfillment was even wider than we yet tend to perceive. Behind such apparently shallow allusions to fulfillment as Matthew's "out of Egypt have I called my son" lies the claim that in Jesus all Israel finds its ultimate realization. Who knows what rich insights in this area still lie beyond our vision?

But the consequences of all this involve more for us than further study. It is incumbent upon us to attempt to preach the relevance of Old Testament history. Here I offer an attempt to point out the typological relevance of one part of Old Testament history, the so-called biography of Jeremiah in Jer. 26-45. In this, as elsewhere, I am greatly indebted to my teacher von Rad.[4]

Why should the life of Jeremiah be recorded? No other prophet's life is recorded in anywhere near such detail. That no attempt is being made to present his life as one of heroic significance is clear from the recording of his ready yielding to Zedekiah's suggestion of a "white" lie in 38:24-28. Actually, chapters 26-45 present no biography of Jeremiah. Their exclusive point of interest is in his sufferings. This is not a biography but a passion history. With no other prophet is the man's life so closely drawn into his message. Of course!—because here the purpose is to show that Jeremiah's life is also revelatory. As chapter

4 G. von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, II (1960), pp. 218-220.

45 hints, Jeremiah's sufferings are but the reflection of God's suffering. Yes, the history of Jeremiah's life is revelatory, but in a yet deeper way. His life has a typological significance. Tersely put, the suffering servant reveals the suffering God and anticipates the suffering Son.

I put forward this one attempt at a practical demonstration of Old Testament hermeneutics with mixed feelings. I am by no means fully confident of the validity of this particular attempt, but I am extremely confident of the value of such an attempt. For it is my conviction that in this burning issue we need not fear so much the failure of our attempts as our failure to risk them.

Albrecht Ritschl and His Current Critics

By Philip J. Hefner

THE case against Albrecht Ritschl is a simple one. It has been rehearsed often, in terms which are easily recalled and passed on. As a consequence we can say as aptly today as H. R. Mackintosh wrote twenty-five years ago, "Ritschl at the moment belongs . . . to the middle distance, too far for gratitude, too near for reverence. He is behind a passing cloud."[1]

Let us rehearse once more the case against Ritschl.[2] It begins with his delineation of the antagonism between man and the world. On the one hand, man sees himself as a helpless fragment, caught in the inexorable causality of nature. On the other, he knows himself as a child of God, and thus a free, spiritual being who has a worth far surpassing that of the whole of nature. From here Ritschl moves to a discussion of man's revulsion at this evaluation of his being as a mere link in the natural causal chain. Man struggles to find authentication for his hegemony over nature, and this struggle is charted in his religions. All religious seek this self-authentication for man, but it is Christianity that actually achieves an adequate solution to the human predicament. Here, in the Christian religion, man discovers that his goals of self-assertion and self-fulfillment are also God's goals, and that the work of Jesus Christ is indeed aimed at precisely this fulfillment which man seeks *over nature*.

From this religious-philosophical description of the human situation, Ritschl could make of the Christian religion, and its God, only the authenticator of man's struggle for superiority over nature. This striving for the ideal of life according to man's highest aspirations constitutes man's moral idealism, his moral striving. God calls and binds

1 H. R. Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology*, p. 141.

2 I have in mind several popular works which seem to share a common view of Ritschl: Karl Barth, *From Rousseau to Ritschl* (Harper, 1959), chapter 11; John Dillenberger and Claude Welch, *Protestant Christianity* (Scribner, 1954), pp. 198-200; H. R. Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology* (Scribner, n.d.), chapter 5; H. R. Niebuhr, *The Meaning of Revelation* (Macmillan, 1941), pp. 25-33.

men together in their moral striving into his Kingdom, which is therefore equivalent to their moral ideals. The Christian religion is thus a moral enterprise, and

> God is the needed prop of ethical aspiration, the trustee of our moral interests. . . . Thus religion tends to become only a new aspect of moral activity. The Kingdom of God, stripped of the eschatological transcendence that belongs to it in the Gospels, is now hardly more than (as with Kant) a realm of moral ends, a purely present and mundane commonwealth.[3]

This is the case against Ritschl as it is commonly held by students today. It is the contention of this paper that the case is far too simple and too far removed from what Ritschl actually said. Without elaborate documentation, I shall attempt so to describe Ritschl's theology that it can be seen to stand in sharp opposition to this popular view. A proper understanding of even the few notions that I have mentioned above can contribute to the dissipation of the cloud behind which Ritschl stands today.

The proposition is this: that the popular view has incorrectly assessed Ritschl's religious-philosophical description of the human predicament; that it has misconstrued his interpretation of the Christian religion as it speaks to that predicament; that it has underestimated the subtlety and profundity of Ritschl's notion of the "moral"; and that it has failed to recognize the modifying and judging force which the Christian religion exerts upon man's moral aspirations.

1. Ritschl's religious-philosophical description of the human predicament is not exhausted in the discussion of the antagonism between man and nature. Ritschl's religious-philosophical comments are much more concerned to lay bare man's innate striving after a wholeness, or completedness (*Ergänzung, Vollkommenheit*), in which his life with all its goals, motives, and actions takes its place in an ordered system (or whole). And not merely a whole but a "whole of its own," "a whole after its own fashion"[4]—an ordered system which is appropriate to and expressive of man's unique humanity. Man is discomfited by the notion that his being is only a part of the natural causal chain, *not*

3 H. R. Mackintosh, *op. cit.*, pp. 150-152.
4 *Die christliche Vollkommenheit* (1874), pp. 8 ff.

because this notion deprives him of wholeness, but rather because it offers him an inadequate sort of wholeness. Such a notion understands his life as a fragment in a system which is ordered in a fashion that is appropriate to and expressive of a total continuum of nature rather than of his unique humanity.

2. This religious-philosophical emphasis on man's drive toward wholeness carries with it an entirely different set of implications than would be the case if the emphasis were on man's antagonism toward nature. These implications concern the interpretation of the Christian religion as it speaks to the human situation. In the first place, man's striving after wholeness is not primarily concerned with the attainment of the tyrannical *power over nature* that is sometimes ascribed to Ritschl.[5] The chief aim of man's striving is the integration of his existence into a whole that will give to that existence a meaning that is commensurate with his essential self-hood. This entails *freedom from nature,* independence from natural causality *as the chief determinant of action, or as the primary motive for existence.*[6] Man in fact strives for incorporation within a system which is inclusive of both his own existence and nature, and which provides for nature's cooperative agency in the attainment of his essential self-hood (which, as will be observed, entails the realization of God's will). The Christian religion is introduced at this point as the solution to the human predicament—*not* as the authenticator of man's superiority over nature, but rather as *the comprehensive system or whole within which man can find his fulfillment and his self-hood, and within which nature is accorded its true meaning as well.*[7]

3. It is at this point that a discussion of two key notions will lay bare the heart of Ritschl's theology. They are these: that as man seeks

5 Karl Barth, *op. cit.,* pp. 396-397, and H. R. Niebuhr, *op. cit.,* pp. 29-32.

6 *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung,* III (3rd ed., 1888), pp. 36 ff., section 49. In most cases, in my opinion, Ritschl's meaning is best preserved by considering the phrase "power over nature," where it occurs in his work, to mean "freedom from nature." His concern is not to depreciate nature, but rather to deny that its processes are self-explanatory, and thus capable of intimidating man. Its meaning comes from its position in a system that comprehends it and man under a larger perspective. This is indicated by the fact that Ritschl consistently associates "power over nature," not, as one might expect, with a notion such as *homo faber,* but rather with belief in God's providence. See *R.u.V.,* III, sections 62-63.

7 *Die christliche Vollkommenheit,* pp. 8 ff. *Unterricht in der christlichen Religion* (1895), section 59. *R.u.V.,* III, pp. 343-345, 472-473, 489-490.

this wholeness, or fulfillment, he stands inseparably related to nature; and that the whole which man seeks must manifest itself as a system of value to which he can commit himself in moral striving.

Ritschl emphasized both man's status as a unique creation of God and his inseparable relatedness to the rest of natural and social creation.[8] As man conducts his life he forges continually new sets of relationships in the world and with the world. Man is always a unique creation-in-relation-to-a-world. Anything which has significance for man, any relationship in which he stands, affects his total relationship to the world. Any ideas concerning man's nature, any ideals concerning his life and commitment—these must be discussed in respect to man-in-relation-to-a-world. The quality and direction of a man's existence—as well as its *meaning*—is evident from the monuments which his life leaves in the form of his indelible relationships to the world of nature and society. It is on this premise that Ritschl rejects all ontological or cosmological schemes which recognize only man's commonality with nature.[9] Such schemes see man only as he is caught in the chain of natural causality—a relationship to the world which allows for his existence to be interpreted only in its meaning as part of the continuum of nature. Man must also stand in some *other* relationship to nature—a relationship fully as intimate, but of a different *kind*, and one which testifies to his uniqueness.

In so far as man is unique and distinct over against nature, *he forges his relationships to nature in and through his moral activity*, that is, activity directed toward a *bonum*, or decision for action which is oriented toward a certain system of value. This means that moral activity always possesses a certain existential import, because it irrevocably alters and re-establishes the moral agent's situation in, and relationship to, all the factors of nature and society which surround him. This is expressed in two of Ritschl's key terms; value-judgment and *Lebenswerk*. A *value-judgment* denotes, for Ritschl, a decision (or commitment) for or against a thing or a person—a decision of such significance that it exerts a practical effect on the structure of man's life in relationship to the world about him.[10] Ritschl speaks of the

8 *R.u.V.*, III, pp. 27-30, sections 62-63.
9 See *Theologie und Metaphysik* (1881), especially pp. 6, 7, 9.
10 *R.u.V.*, III, pp. 195 ff., 370-376.

value-judgment as a mode of cognition in religion which is contrasted to the purely intellectualistic cognition that does not practically alter man's relationship to the world.

This existential impact of the notion of the moral is further emphasized by Ritschl's term *Lebenswerk* (life-work, which is inclusive of, but not to be equated with, one's occupation or employment).[11] This term points to the fact that the cumulative product of the value-judgments is a life, a monument fashioned out of man's activity in the world, his encounter with the reality that lies outside himself. It is this *Lebenswerk* which testifies to the truth or falsity, ultimate worth or uselessness, of that system of value to which man has committed himself in his moral activity. It is this *Lebenswerk* which reveals the sort of wholeness that man's existence has attained. It is in his *Lebenswerk*, produced by his moral activity, that man succeeds or fails in the attempt to realize his essential self-hood.

These two notions—man's relationship to nature and his moral activity—hold important implications for Ritschl's theology. First, it must follow that whatever impact religious faith (i.e., its correlate, the *action of God*) has on man, this it exerts also on his relationship to the world and on his stance over against it. Similarly, whatever activity or response man undertakes in his relationship to God must also affect his particular stance in relation to the world. Second, it must follow that if religious faith (or God's revelation) is to be relevant to man, communicable to him, it must be cast according to the lineaments of the "moral," i.e., in terms of a system of value upon which man can orient his moral activity.

4. It is evident that there has been a hidden presupposition at work in our discussion from the beginning. It is the assertion that man's moral activity, his encounter with the reality that lies over against him in the world, is informed by something that is not contained in this world. This presupposed factor is the "religious," or the "spiritual." That which is meant to focus chiefly on God—his promise and call to man, his work for man, and his uniting men through Christ in the church, as well as man's cultic response to God—is termed religious,

11 *R.u.V.*, II (3rd ed., 1889), pp. 370-371; III, pp. 156, 157, 401; *Die christliche Vollkommenheit*, pp. 9-10; *Unterricht in der christlichen Religion*, section 57.

or spiritual. That which is meant to focus primarily on God's demand upon man as it reaches him in the context of his relationship to the world, and on man's response in the same context, is termed the moral or ethical. The moral aspect is the externally visible factor in the Christian religion. The religious aspect, which includes the goal, the systematic framework, the stimulus, and the enabling power for the moral is intangible in the sense that it is an object of faith.

Proceeding from Ritschl's view of man's relatedness to the world, it follows that it is flatly contradictory to conceive of either the moral or the religious apart from the other. Ritschl insists, furthermore, that *the moral must be subsumed under the religious.*[12] This is the first example of the modifying force of the religious (in this case the Christian religion) upon the moral. The moral has no direction without the religious. It would have to proceed as if man's life and action in the world were self-explanatory. But activity in the world can be adequately explained only when the religious is presupposed. The religious must affect man in his relation to the world. But its effect, says Ritschl, is not primarily ontological or cosmological; rather, it is existential—i.e., it affects his *action* in the world, as to its *bonum, telos,* enabling cause, and systematic elaboration. In concrete terms (as Ritschl defines them), it affects his value-judgments and *Lebenswerk.* They cannot but be altered (and reflect the alteration) as a result of being informed by the religious.

The religious, then, informs and shapes the moral. Furthermore (and this is extremely important), *the moral constitutes the form in which man gains knowledge of God. The moral is the subjective correlate of God's objective action upon man.* This is the second example of the modifying force of the Christian religion upon the moral. Because man's distinctly *human* existence is comprised largely of his moral activity directed toward a *bonum* in an intimate relationship to nature, man gains knowledge of the Other (God) over against him in the form of stimuli to moral activity.

Taking a cue from Hermann Lotze, Ritschl holds that man's recognition of God's action reaches his awareness as a stimulus to decisive action, so that both the passive reaction to God's acts and the

12 *R.u.V.,* III, Introduction.

decision to independent action of his own are taken up in a single event.[13] Ritschl holds that the relationship between man's moral activity and God's action is similar to that which obtains between the sensations of noise in one's ear and the vibrations in the air which give rise to that noise. The sensations of noise are not to be equated with the vibrations, and the form of each is quite different; but the sensations are inseparable from the vibrations, and they constitute the only means of knowledge that the average man can gain of those vibrations.[14] Man can know God only in terms of God's action for and upon him, and this action directs man's moral activity toward the only *bonum* that is ultimately adequate—God's own will. It is from this basis that Ritschl operates when he concludes:

> Out of this fundamental rule of psychology arises the task of scientific theology: to demonstrate all that is recognizable as the gracious work of God upon the Christian in the corresponding religious and moral acts which are stimulated through revelation as a whole and the particular means included in it.[15]

The religious informs the moral, and the moral constitutes the form in which man gains knowledge of the religious. This makes of the moral a *formal* concept whose *material* is furnished by the human awareness as it is impinged upon by God's revelation.

We now turn to the precise impact of this revelation upon man's moral activity (and this is a third example of the modification which the Christian religion, in Ritschl's theology, exerts upon the moral). This impact is threefold: (a) *The Christian Faith provides the system of value to which man must commit himself if he is to attain his ultimate wholeness.*[16] This system of value is the Kingdom of God. The term "Kingdom of God" is defined in the same subtle manner as the term "moral." It constitutes both man's highest end and God's self-expression of his will in the world. God fulfills his own will as he leads men to a commitment to that will. At the same time man's highest end consists in the realization of God's will in his own existence. This is the ultimate

13 *Ibid.*, section 3.
14 *Ibid.*, pp. 20, 21.
15 *R.u.V.*, III, p. 22, translation by the writer.
16 *Unterricht in der christlichen Religion*, section 5 (2nd ed.); *R.u.V.*, III, pp. 196, 278-282, 317.

"difference" entailed in the Christian faith: a reorientation in respect to the source of meaning and direction which informs man's existence.

(b) *The Christian faith discloses the act of God which enables man to commit himself to God's will.*[17] This act is the justification and reconciliation wrought in Christ. This interpretation of the work of Christ proceeds from the nature of the Old Testament sacrifices, which testify to God's drawing nigh unto man, in order to break down the estrangement between God and man.[18] The estrangement, in Ritschl's view, consists of man's inflexible stubbornness, his refusal to recognize God and to submit his will to God's. Ritschl therefore rejects all theories of the atonement which point to Christ's work as that of placating God's wrath, performing a work in man's place, restoring God's honor, or relieving man of his moral responsibility. Rather, Christ's chief work is to reveal God's reconciling love to man, to restore the relationship of communion between man and God, to enable man to harmonize his will with God's. This does not mean that man's sin is forgotten nor that he is no longer aware of his guilt nor that he can now perfectly perform God's will. It means rather that sin and guilt no longer have power over man. They no longer have the power to disrupt man's relationship to God. Man's will can now be brought into alignment with God's will—which constitutes the whole into which man's existence must be integrated. Sin and imperfect performance remain; but they cannot destroy the union of wills between God and man. Man thus has the freedom to commit himself to that *bonum,* or system of value, that can give him ultimate wholeness. And he also has freedom from the world in the sense that it can no longer intimidate him through natural causality in respect to his ultimate salvation.

(c) *The Christian faith points to certain characteristics which the man who has achieved wholeness will exhibit in his existence.*[19] These characteristics all pertain to man's conducting his existence in the world from the new source of meaning and direction furnished by God's revelation. Included here is *belief in God's providence,* which consists of humility (defined as surrender to God's guidance) and patience (de-

17 This theme runs through the three volumes of *R.u.V.* See also *Theologie und Metaphysik,* pp. 28, 29.

18 *R.u.V.,* II, sections 23-27.

19 *Die christliche Vollkommenheit,* pp. 11-18; *R.u.V.,* III, sections 63-68.

ned as confidence that everything which befalls one is part of God's lan which works for goodness); *prayer* should reflect man's praise o God and gratitude for this guidance and protection; and finally, one s compelled to conduct one's existence before God in a particular situa- on, namely, in one's *vocation,* the place alone where the monuments f one's life are to be erected. The thrust here, too, is that one is to ve one's life in the natural sphere, while at the same time denying hat that natural sphere can provide adequate meaning for life. Life nds its ultimately satisfactory meaning only when it is oriented upon he revelation of God in Christ as its center.

All of the foregoing reveals a dialectic at work in Ritschl's theology oncerning the relationship between man's moral striving for self-hood nd God's purpose. The fact that in the world of time and space the tter must be realized within the structure of the former (according o Ritschl) does not necessarily mean that God's purposes are to be dentified with man's moral aspirations.[20] It does mean that God's pur- oses must be meaningfully related to man's drive for self-hood. It neans also that the very notion of man's desiring his own highest and truest self-fulfillment entails a modification of that desire *away* from man and *toward* God's ends.

This gives the lie to the oft-quoted statement that "Christianity, e [Ritschl] insisted, is an absolutely ethical religion."[21] Ritschl's full tatement is this:

> Christianity, then, is the monotheistic, perfectly spiritual and moral (ethical) religion, which, on the basis of its Founder's life-work (*Lebenswerk*) of redemption nd the establishing of the Kingdom of God, consists in the freedom of divine sonhip, includes in itself the impulse toward the activity of love (which is directed oward the ethical organization of mankind), and grounds blessedness on sonship s well as on the Kingdom of God.[22]

What I have intended by this sketch of Ritschl's theology is to ndicate that there is another view of Ritschl besides the one commonly eld in current textbooks. It can easily be documented by a careful read- ng of his work (of which, unfortunately, too much lies untranslated

20 See especially Karl Barth, *op. cit.,* p. 393.
21 Dillenberger and Welch, *op. cit.,* p. 200; H. R. Mackintosh, *op. cit.,* p. 151.
22 *R.u.V.,* III, p. 14. Translation by the writer.

from the German). The man is open to criticism, but not on the basis of current interpretations. An evaluation of Ritschl's work cannot be undertaken here. But such work, whenever and by whomever it is finally undertaken, will have to take into account much more thoroughly than has been done up to date the structure and sequence of his own statements. And primarily this—his understanding of the Christian faith as it is relevant to man's indomitable, existential striving for self-hood in the context of an inseparable relationship to the world of nature and society.

An Appraisal of the Hymn Texts in the Service Book and Hymnal

By Benjamin Lotz

THE new *Service Book and Hymnal*[1] has been in use in many of our churches for approximately two or three years. Gradually the number of these churches has increased, though no figures have been published except for the number of volumes sold. No accounting has been made concerning the percentage of congregations using the book in the various bodies that sponsored its publication. Neither has anything been reported about the geographical distribution of the congregations which have purchased this book.

Since the introduction of the new hymnal, there have been sporadic criticisms as well as fulsome praises, though the writer has encountered more of the former. It would appear that publications of the various Lutheran bodies have not permitted extended criticisms of the volume, or (and this may seem less credible) no one has been sufficiently interested to undertake careful, critical appraisals. Occasionally someone will make a discovery and utter a cry of anguish or derision. In such cases, the printed criticism has evoked a forthright defense from admirers of the book. The number of these is undoubtedly not inconsiderable.

The time has come when rather complete analyses ought to be made of certain aspects of the hymnal, looking toward a revision. Inasmuch as a revision requires six, eight, or ten years to be completed, a new committee on revision should always be appointed as soon as a new hymnbook comes from the presses.[2] Any delay can do injury to the work of the church, for as the church is a living organism, its forms of worship and its use of hymns must constantly be adapted to its ever changing life. Only a prompt revision meets the need, and this is something to which one must look forward.

1 *The Service Book and Hymnal of the Lutheran Church in America*, 1958.

2 When the *Common Service Book* (1917) was published there was immediate demand that the texts of the hymns be printed between the staves of music. This was resisted for about eight years, and finally the present compromise was effected.

An adequate revision will be possible if certain preliminary studies are made at once. On the basis of these studies, opinion can be crystalized in an intelligent manner, and the support of the cooperating churches can be secured. This has not been the procedure in the preparation of *The Service Book and Hymnal,* for while reports were presented to the various bodies before the publication of the volume, these reports were intended to present information rather than to seek out what the congregations needed in the way of liturgy and hymns.

The studies which are now envisioned should, among other things, treat the purpose of the book as a whole. This would mean the liturgical principles underlying its structure, the size of the possible book as compared with existing volumes, its format, and last—but certainly not least in importance—whether it represents and reflects the teaching of the Lutheran Churches in America. Subsequent pages of this article will indicate some neglect of this last criterion.

Particular studies should be undertaken to disclose where in the hymnal the most drastic changes have been introduced. There ought to be a thoroughgoing analysis in regard to the scope of the hymnal, its size, its balance, and its usefulness. Consideration ought to be given to its theological soundness, its understandability, its artistic structure, and its relevance to contemporary need. A similar examination needs be made concerning the music of the liturgy and the hymnal. Such a study should ascertain how much of it is useful in all types of congregations. Similarly it ought to be ascertained how many settings are desirable on the basis of usage, and how many alternate arrangements should be provided for portions of the liturgy.

Along with these studies, a careful, critical eye should be turned on the tunes of the various hymns, the number as well as the kind. It is not too early to make a survey to discover whether hymn tunes introduced for the first time are being sung, and if so, why. It should be determined if certain hymns will ever be used because of the kind of tune attached to them, and whether the inclusion of these hymn tunes has meant the exclusion of more useful ones.[3]

This is a large order. It is not a task for one committee. Rather,

3 For more than forty years, certain plain song melodies have been found in the *Common Service Book.* To the writer's knowledge, no survey has ever been made to ascertain their use. What will be the fate of the Bach harmonizations in the SBH?

e proposed studies should be made by new committees with wide, presentative memberships. The analysis of *The Service Book and ymnal,* looking to a possible revision, must be made by men and omen working not only as committee members but also as individuals. here will have to be surveys through the whole length and breadth the church, and these studies will have to be of an empirical kind. or if the new book diverges from previous Lutheran service books any important aspect, justification of such divergence must be ubstantiated.

I

Obviously the present study can attempt nothing so exhaustive. In ct, the author has deliberately limited himself to a study of the hymn xts of the new book. In doing so, he seeks to open up a very impor- nt aspect of possible revision, though he is conscious that his analysis faulty and imperfect. He does attempt to suggest criteria, apart from ose stated explicitly in the "Introduction," that the compilers of the ook followed in the selection of their materials. If these criteria are vident, then the wisdom of their choice ought to be discernible.

An attempt is also made to see how far the personal tastes of the ompilers and their predilections are evident and how far their ethnic ackgrounds are reflected in the choice of certain hymns. With what ttle knowledge the author has of certain pressures which were un- oubtedly exerted, he seeks to indicate how pressures are apparent in he collection. While he cannot discuss every possible phase of this col- ction, the author believes that he will have presented sufficient evi- ence to indicate that the work on a revision of the hymn texts should egin at once.

It will be evident that consideration is given to certain hymns under ubrics like ordination and the Lord's Supper and to the hymns dealing ith the last things. With some trepidation the writer has questioned he inclusion of hymns which seem to lack the strong evangelical note hat should characterize every Lutheran hymn and hymnal. When ymns of this nature are considered carefully, there can be no doubt hat a great deal of analysis must be done. For in any possible revision uch thought must be given to the balance of materials presented. In

fact, there is little evidence that the new book has been based on theological principles, an understanding of which is just as necessary here as in the work of preaching or Christian education.

As one pages through *The Service Book and Hymnal* one's first impression is very pleasing. The printing, the format, the binding, the quality of the paper are excellent. It follows other Lutheran hymnals in presenting the first hymns according to the ecclesiastical year from Advent through the Trinity season. A glance at the table of contents might reveal certain omissions, and at the same time certain additions which may lend an appearance of originality to the volume. A more careful inspection of the book might cause the first impression to be changed.

Closer study of the hymns will reveal an antiquarian interest apparently unknown to any recent Lutheran hymnbook. This may be due to the predilections of certain members of the commission whose dominant interest is discernible throughout the book. In some cases, this tendency might be defended on a scholarly basis. It might be an honest attempt to raise the standards of the church and also to present material of historical importance. It is also quite manifest that there have been few attempts to alter hymns, and with seemingly few exceptions the texts are left in the state in which they came from authors or translators.

Several illustrations can be given. While the declension of the name "Jesus" is no longer observed in contemporary English, the Latin vocative *Jesu* is retained in at least two places (nos. 51, 175). The ordinary worshiper, if ignorant of Latin grammar, will probably consider this form a misprint. There is no consistency in the spelling of the word *Sion* or *Zion* except that the latter is usually used in translated hymns (e.g., 3, 314). Another example of the antiquarian tendency may be seen in the second stanza of hymn 508:

My heart is weak and poor
Until it master find;
It has no spring of action sure
It varies with the wind.

For the modern ear, not only is the rhyme artificial, but the syntax is difficult. The writer deals with students who have been admitted to col-

ge after a more rigorous testing than the average layman experiences, nd he doubts that the verb will be recognized as a present subjunctive. gain it must look like a misprint. If this were an isolated case, it ight be overlooked. Sometimes the archaic flavor is found not only certain stanzas but in a whole hymn. Parts of four pages have been lotted to an extremely literary translation of a medieval hymn atibuted to Bernard of Cluny (534). Here are a few of the difficult rses:

For thee, O dear, dear country
Mine eyes their vigils keep. . . .
Is unction to the breast
And medicine in sickness. . . .
And smiles have no alloy. . . .
His laud and benediction. . . .
Thine is the victor's laurel
And thine the golden dower.

Antiquarian interest can also be seen in the desire to retain a form the *Dies Irae*. The new hymnal provides it in a paraphrased form Walter Scott. This medieval hymn is used at requiem masses in the oman Church today. Hymnologists may justify its inclusion on the round that it is a great hymn of the Middle Ages. On that basis a ea might be made for "O Ewigkeit, Du Donnerwort" or "Vak Upp! ör Vakten Ljuder."[4]

A hymn which in addition manifests a kind of allegorizing of the criptures is the Epiphany hymn "Earth Has Many a Noble City" (51).

Eastern sages at his cradle
Make oblations rich and rare;
See them give, in deep devotion,
Gold and frankincense, and myrrh.

Sacred gifts of mystic meaning:
Incense doth their God disclose,
Gold the King of kings proclaimeth,
Myrrh his sepulchre foreshows.

4 If one presses the argument that hymns should be included because of their historical portance, the attempts of Luther to put parts of the mass in German rhymned verse would stify placing *Wir Glauben All an Einem Gott* and *Jesaia dem Propheten Das Geschah* in e hymnal.

Recently the writer of this article, reading I Kings 18:29 (RSV), asked a hundred or more college students for the meaning of "oblation." Only a few knew its meaning. If the new hymnal were to become a family service book, used and treasured for home devotions, greater leisure might permit hymns of this kind to be studied and the meaning of unusual words to be learned. At the present time there is no indication that this might become the case. Rather, the hymns will be used in our churches by all sorts and conditions of men who, in most cases, will hear strange sounds and make little sense of them.

A further study of the collection indicates that the compilers had inordinate interest in hymns of the medieval period, hymns of the Roman Church, and hymn translations arising from the Oxford Movement. It is doubtful whether any other Lutheran hymnal in the whole world would have the following emphasis: Abelard (596); Ambrose (133, 206, 219); Augustine (578); Bernard of Clairvaux (66, 88, 468, 481, 483); Bernard of Cluny (527, 534, 584, 586); Faber (86, 138, 181, 199, 493, 498, 516, 589); Fortunatus (61, 75, 93, 104); Francis of Assisi (173); Keble (201, 226, 362, 394); Neale (54, 290); Newman (211, 411, 523); Thomas Aquinas (272, 277, 280); Thomas a Kempis (591). Hymns from the apostate Faber equal the number of hymns from the pen of Paul Gerhardt. There are two more hymns of Faber than of Wallin, and one more than of Grundtvig.

Of course, it ought to be evident that the source of a particular hymn is not necessarily the criterion. Luther's bold words in regard to the authorship of New Testament books can be applied to hymns as well: A hymn may witness to Christ and his Gospel even if Cardinal Newman, Harry Emerson Fosdick, or Mary Baker Eddy wrote it! On the other hand, there is something incongruous about alien voices receiving such disproportionate representation in our hymnbooks.[5]

An interesting case is "Alleluia, Song of Sweetness" (58). In the *Common Service Book* this hymn, in a different translation, was also placed under the rubric "Septuagesima to Lent." While the "Alleluia" is sometimes omitted in the gradual for this period, the hymn contains this Hebrew word. Why was the hymn then placed

5 The desire of the compilers to include a great number from the Latin Church is evidenced by 28 translations by John Mason Neale.

nder this rubric? The use of a stanza not printed in the earlier hymnal ut used in the new one might tell the story.

Alleluia our transgressions
Make us for a while forego;
For the solemn time is coming
When our tears for sin must flow.

he emphasis in this stanza is discernible. For the Roman Church Lent s a time of special penance when transgressions are for a while forgone.

Attention has been paid in portions of the church press to the hristmas hymn "Angels We Have Heard on High" (30) with its lmost playful reference to Mary and Joseph.[6] Attention ought to be alled to the inclusion of *Stabat Mater* in the form "At the Cross, er Station Keeping." Though invocation to the Virgin Mary is lack- ng, this seems to be only the second time it has been included in a Lu- neran hymnal.[7] Furthermore, the calling on the ninefold choir of ngels and the most gracious "bearer of the eternal Word" in "Ye Vatchers and Ye Holy Ones" (437) is so obscure to the average wor- niper that he will sing it without raising his dander.

At the risk of laboring the point, other examples will be given. he poet laureate of England should be able to write understandable nglish. The reader will have to decide whether the fifth stanza of O Splendor of God's Glory Bright" (206) is sufficiently clear to have een incorporated in a hymnbook.

Rejoicing may this day go hence;
Like virgin dawn our innocence,
Like fiery noon our faith appear,
Nor know the gloom of twilight drear.

r the sixth stanza which reads in part:

Morn in her rosy car is borne;
Let him come forth, our perfect morn. . . .

6 Cf. *The Lutheran,* January 20, 1960, p. 34. ". . . I was singing heartily, . . . found myself tering these words: 'Mary, Joseph, lend your aid,' invoking the saints like any benighted ish Catholic. . . . The longer we use this book the more of these 'riches' we find in it."
7 *The Lutheran Hymnary* also contains an "evangelical form" of this hymn.

Passages that are difficult to understand appear in other hymns which are less literary—for example, "Beneath the Cross of Jesus" (482). Human sinfulness is described as a wonder and is placed in juxtaposition with the glorious love of Christ. Another example may be seen in the rather modern hymn by Chesterton, "O God of Earth and Altar" (344). This stanza particularly ought to be noted:

Tie in a living tether
The prince and priest and thrall,
Bind all our lives together,
Smite us and save us all:
In ire and exultation,
Aflame with faith, and free,
Lift up a living nation,
A single sword to thee.

In revising the hymnal a competent committee ought not merely examine the hymns with obscure terminology but also decide whether there may not be too many mystical hymns. The German mystic Tersteegen has four hymns credited to him, and they are all of this character. The highly refined poem of Harriet Beecher Stowe, "Still, Still with Thee" (496), has been added to the collection, though it has before been part of *The Hymnal* of the Augustana Lutheran Church. In this connection it might be well to note the tendency to remove expressions which might jar on the feelings of sensitive spirits. In some cases this has meant the deletion of whole hymns, or perhaps of a single stanza. "Alas! and Did my Saviour Bleed" (486) has been retained but the reference to the worm is gone. "From Greenland's Icy Mountains" (310) has been retained, but the stanza on the vileness of man is gone. "Come, Thou Fount of every Blessing" does not appear in the new hymnal, though its omission can hardly be attributed to the obscure reference to Ebenezer. It is not impossible that members of the commission were occasionally influenced by the demands and wishes of congregations which might use the book, though there is no specific reference to this in the preface. In fact, before undertaking revision it would be desirable to consider the criteria which the committee indicated in the preface and to judge whether these are the proper criteria for a Lutheran hymnal.

II

The question of suitable translations and the insertion of original mns can be a thorny one in the preparation of a hymnal. Obviously, nen Lutherans compile a new hymnbook, there is the additional prob- n of hymns used by ethnic groups which are an integral part of their angelical heritage. Then there is often an understandable temptation make fresh translations, and the task may be assigned to the more fted members of the commission. The question is then raised whether anslations should be considered while the translators are present, and nether members of the commission should be permitted to submit eir own compositions for consideration. It appears that in the case the new hymnal there was no effective deterrent to prevent this (cf. , 103, 209, 233, 241, 249, 353).

If all the circumstances connected with the compilation of this and her Lutheran service books were made known, the story would be interesting one. Many American Lutherans will remember Jeremiah Ohl, a forthright and zealous man who was active in the preparation the *Common Service Book*. He secured the inclusion of ten of the mn tunes he composed. Time has exercised better judgment; in the w book only two of these remain. In the revision of *The Service ook and Hymnal* it is very unlikely that all of the original hymns will main. In any case, it is hard to see why "Christ is Risen" (CSB 117) d to give way to "Now Let the Vault of Heaven Resound" (103).[8]

Pressures from ethnic groups outside the committee may be as eat as the pressure due to immodesty within the committee. This may count for the amount of unnecessary repetition in the hymnal. In y Lutheran hymnbook one would expect to find that queen of the orales, "Wie schön leuchtet der Morgenstern." It is found in the w hymnal as "How Brightly Beams the Morning Star" (404). The me hymn is found in an English translation of a Danish translation or paraphrase) of the same German hymn (32), and there is also

8 A story is told of how both John C. Mattes and J. F. Ohl pressed for the inclusion of eir own translations of *Herzliebster Jesu* at a meeting of the *Common Service Book* com- ttee almost fifty years ago. It might have been a deadlock had not C. M. Jacobs read the anslation of Robert Bridges (100) to the committee and immediately moved its adoption. en can be inordinately fond of their own verse!

another translation into English of a Swedish translation (or paraphrase) of the same German hymn (33).

On the other hand, it is hard to attribute to pressure from ethnic groups the insertion of various versions of Psalm 23. Sabbath-saying, tithe-paying, psalm-singing Presbyterian Covenanters have not filled Lutheran pews. The movement has rather been in the opposite direction. Likely the hymn version "The King of Love my Shepherd Is" (530) has become a favorite with all bodies which cooperated in the new hymnal. Even the inclusion of several more versions (e.g., 520, 524) might be excusable inasmuch as they have handled the psalm in a free and attractive manner. But the further inclusion of "The Lord's my Shepherd" (522) and "The Lord my Shepherd Is" (526) seems difficult to justify.

III

At this place it might be well to turn to a more serious matter, a theological one. The criterion of a correct understanding of the Gospel seems not to have been the dominant one in the preparation of the hymnal. This may be evident, for example, in the choice of hymns for ordination. Granted that there may not be many hymns suitable for this particular service—though only a few appropriate hymns are needed—the emphasis should be on the office of the ministry of Word and sacraments and not on a priestly order. In the hymn "O Pour Thy Spirit from on High" (302), the first stanza has these verses:

> *Graces and gifts to each supply,*
> *And clothe thy priests with righteousness.*

The desire for a revision of the hymnal is strengthened by an examination of the hymns dealing with the Lord's Supper. There is an emphasis different from that of any Lutheran hymnbook of the past.[9] The selection in *The Service Book and Hymnal* contains much material

9 The SBH has 24 hymns under the rubric "Holy Communion." Twelve of these are not found in other Lutheran hymnals, though the writer was not able to examine the *Lutheran Hymnary* at the time his analysis was made. Four more are not found in any other Lutheran hymnbook except the *Common Service Book*. A further analysis will reveal that the new hymns are not generally from recent contributions but from the ancient and medieval church.

nerally found in Roman and Anglican manuals of worship and fre-ently associated with non-Lutheran teaching. One of these, "O Sav-g Victim" (277), is sung in the Roman Catholic Church at the ex-sition and adoration of the consecrated host in the service of benedic-n. If this association is not sufficient to question its inclusion in a utheran collection, its opening lines are likely to be so incomprehensible the ordinary layman—of whom God made so many!—that its use ill be discouraged on that basis alone. The first tune, if not the second, ill be a further deterrent to its use in any average congregation.

The next hymn that ought to be considered is another one by homas Aquinas, "Thee we Adore, O Hidden Saviour" (272). Like any eucharistic hymns from similar sources, the stress seems to be a localized presence of Christ in the elements.[10] This tendency was mmon among hymn writers of the last century, but the Lutheran derstanding of the Lord's Supper stresses a *personal* presence. Par-cularly objectionable is the following:

> *Strengthen for service,*
> *Lord, the hands that holy things have taken* (286).

reater objection has been raised to "And Now, O Father, Mindful of e Love" (278), which at least in its terminology seems to stress a nd of sacrifice. As these hymns are examined one after another, it is ard to believe that members of the same ecclesiastical body that pro-uced the statement on the Sacrament of the Altar which was recently esented to the meeting of the United Lutheran Church in America in tlantic City[11] could have participated in the selection of these hymns approved their inclusion in the hymnal.

IV

Anyone acquainted with the hymnological literature of the Lu-eran Church knows that Lutherans have been distressed at the lack

10 This raises an interesting question and points to a fruitful field of investigation. *The merican Lutheran Hymnal* (325) contains "Lo upon the Altar Lies" and *The Lutheran ymnal* (Missouri Synod) has a hymn with a similar import written by M. Loy (304). The mn of H. E. Jacobs (265) also reflects this view.

11 This report will be accessible in the *Minutes* of the U.L.C.A., 1960.

of evangelical sentiment or a truly Christian message in certain well known hymns. Generally Lutherans have been just as insistent on the purity of the message in sacred song as they have been on that in the preaching of the Gospel. In fact, they have often labored to make a hymn witness for the Christian faith.

The familiar hymn by Sarah Flower Adams, "Nearer my God to Thee" (577), is a case in point. Shortly after the hymn was written, Elizabeth Payson Prentiss wrote a hymn, structurally modeled after it, with a Christian content. This hymn, "More Love to Thee," has been included in the new hymnal (392). Shortly after the publication of the hymn of Miss Adams, Henry Eyster Jacobs wrote a similar hymn in the same meter but with a definitely dogmatic content. This hymn, which was placed in the *Common Service Book* (336) and found its way into other Lutheran collections, was rejected by the editors of *The Service Book and Hymnal*. If this omission stood alone, it might be passed over as an oversight or as an indication that the hymn by Jacobs was personally distasteful to a majority of the editors. However, other significant omissions are revealed by a careful study, and the insertion of hymns lacking an evangelical note is conspicuous. It cannot be denied that a large body of English hymnody belongs to the latter class. This can perhaps be explained on the ground that many English Protestants felt obliged to sing rhymed versions of the Old Testament psalms. This was a Calvinistic rather than a Lutheran opinion, but it has had influence among American Lutherans.

It is possible, on the other hand, to find hymns of Luther which also seem to lack an evangelical note. "Out of the Depths I Cry to Thee" (372) lacks the full assurance which Christian hope brings, though part of the lack may be attributed to the present translation, which differs somewhat from that of Miss Winkworth.[12] A similar criticism cannot be made concerning "Ein' feste Burg" (150), for here Luther allowed himself sufficient freedom to extract Christian assurance from Psalm 46.

Such hymns, based on the Old Testament and lacking in an evangelical note, might well be designated as sub-Christian. The writer

12 It would be helpful to study the translations in the SBH and compare these with previous translations of the same hymns in other books.

ılizes that when he deplores the use of particular hymns of this type or precates their number in the hymnal, the use of such hymns will be fended. It is not to be gainsaid that some of these hymns are among e greatest and best loved of English hymns. Few excel them in poetic ace and beauty, and no compiler of an English hymnal would exclude ne of them, regardless of how short they fall in loyalty to the Gospel. ɔne of them are addressed not merely to God but also to the Lord, ıich does not necessarily exclude the Lord Jesus Christ as a possible ferent. Others of these hymns supposedly acquire an orthodox color-g by the addition of a trinitarian doxology in the last stanza.[13]

It will obviously be difficult to find hard and fast criteria for ·mns, particularly to make a decision if they are Christian hymns or b-Christian hymns. Tentatively it does seem that the number of sub-ıristian hymns in the new hymnal has increased both in number and proportion beyond any Lutheran hymnbook of the past. It ought to determined whether this assertion can be justified or not before a vision of the book is attempted. A basis for this judgment seems to in the fact that the compilers have been particularly attracted to non-utheran writers in England and New England whose versification ıd literary gifts excel those found in translations by Winkworth, ɔy, Schaeffer, or Brückner.

Another factor may be suggested which has facilitated the intro-ıction of these sub-Christian hymns into the collection. In the intro-ıction to the hymnal portion, where desirable criteria are suggested ɔr the selection of suitable hymns, there is mention, in rather vague ıd poorly defined terms, of agreement with the teachings of the Word God. This permits, it seems, the introduction of all kinds of poetry! Had the criterion been more definite and explicit, many hymns would ave had to be omitted.

The writer realizes the difficulty he encounters when he designates ɔt one hymn, or two, but one hundred or so hymns in the collection hich might be called sub-Christian, particularly if strict standards are ɔplied. As will be repeatedly asserted, many persons read Christian ɔtions into sub-Christian hymns, and thus the use of these hymns in ır churches will be defended. An example might be "Lead, Kindly

13 Three hymns, selected at random, are 510, 538, 568. While they have been associated ith Christian worship, these hymns could be sung in a Jewish temple.

Light," which has generally not been accepted in American Lutheran hymnbooks. Theodore Schmauck is reported to have objected strenuously to its introduction in the *Common Service Book,* and the late Joseph Seiss felt that the addition of a stanza addressed to Jesus Christ was desirable.[14] The present compilers did not feel this need.

The average church-goer is not aware of the historical circumstances in which many of our hymns have been written; he judges the suitability of a hymn by its singable tune. Many read the present Unitarian version of the apostate Faber's "Faith of our Fathers" (516) without misgiving. They do not know that the reference to martyrs is to Roman Catholics in the time of Protestant Elizabeth. They do not know that the hymn was written to bring England back to the Roman faith. They do not know that before the Unitarian paraphrase was made, these lines were included:

Faith of our fathers! Mary's prayers
Shall win our country back to thee.

In fact, it is not difficult to imagine that after a celebration of the Reformation this travesty on the Reformation may be used to close the service. The irony of ignorance could not go further. In any case, a careful examination of the present text will not disclose any specifically Christian convictions.

As has been suggested, undoubtedly no other Lutheran hymnal has included such a large selection from Unitarian writers, more specifically writers from New England. There are many other writers included, too, who are Universalists, Quakers, or even Independents of a liberal, if not a non-evangelical, tradition. A partial list of these authors is here given with the titles of some of their hymns as an incentive for further investigation.

Charles T. Brooks	God Bless our Native Land (358)
William Cullen Bryant	Thou, Whose Unmeasured Temple Stands (246)
	Look from Thy Sphere of Endless Day (325)
William Henry Burleigh	Lead us, O Father, in the Paths of Peace (472)
John White Chadwick	Eternal Ruler of the Ceaseless Round (350)

14 *The Lutheran Hymnary* added a stanza by E. H. Bickersteth (546).

ctavius Frothingham	Thou Lord of Hosts, whose Guiding Hand (305)
liver Wendell Holmes	Lord of All Being, Throned Afar (170)
rederick Lucian Hosmer[15]	O Light from Age to Age the Same (247)
	Thy Kingdom Come! On Bended Knee (331)
	O Thou in All Thy Might So Far (480)
	Not Always on the Mount May We (535)
	O Lord of Life, Where'er They Be (600)
ulia Ward Howe	Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory (356)
amuel Johnson	Holy Spirit, Truth Divine (130)
	I Look to Thee in Every Need (490)
ames Russell Lowell	Once to Every Man and Nation (547)
ohn Milton	The Lord Will Come and Not Be Slow (327)
	Let Us with a Gladsome Mind (405)
arriet Beecher Stowe	Still, Still with Thee (496)
ohn Greenleaf Whittier	All Things are Thine, No Gift Have We (244)
	I Bow my Forehead to the Dust (371)
	O Brother Man, Fold to thy Heart thy Brother (539)
	I Know Not What the Future Hath (593)
William Wordsworth	Blest are the Moments, Doubly Blest (218)

Unfortunately a similar criticism may often be leveled at evangelical writers, even Paul Gerhardt. One of his greatest hymns is not outspokenly Christian (568). Sometimes it is not the translator who makes certain hymns less pronouncedly Christian but the editor who deletes lines or stanzas. In the new hymnal the criterion seems to be literary form rather than purity of proclamation and response (cf. 312, 588).

While it has been stated that the non-Lutheran profession of hymn writers cannot be the sole criterion, neither can the sanctity of the author's life. If this were the basis, Lutherans would not sing the opium dealer's "In the Cross of Christ I glory" (64). Christian believers may testify that in the singing of this hymn, or in the use of sub-Christian hymns, their hearts have been touched by Christian love and have been moved to venture greater things for Christ's kingdom. An example might be found in "O Perfect Love" (300). Though this hymn was written by an Anglican, it might be acceptable to a Spiritualist

15 In his *Story of Christian Hymnody* (Rock Island: Augustana Press, 1959) E. E. Ryden finds Hosmer not sufficiently specific in describing the coming of God's kingdom (pp. 578 ff.). This judgment did not cause neglect of Hosmer, as can be seen by the number of hymns from his pen included in the SBH.

or Unitarian. For the Christian, perfect love can only refer to Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Other hymns are Christian only in the sense that a Trinitarian doxology has been appended (cf. 460, 462).

One of the reasons why the number of sub-Christian hymns bulks so large may be the otherwise laudable attempt to provide hymns with a contemporary reference. The desire to find a message like that of the ancient prophet Amos which would stir men's consciences to right wrongs and establish justice is very commendable. Hymns of this type which also reflect evangelical understanding of the cross are not abundant. A study of the hymns under this rubric will make that very clear (see 343-357).

Even at the expense of repetition it should be stated that the problem is not the existence of sub-Christian hymns but the number of them. The writer believes that the balance of the collection has been destroyed by the inclusion of so large a proportion. Anyone interested can examine this list, from which some may be taken and others may be added: 152, 154, 157, 160, 163, 168, 171, 172, 176, 177, 183, 184, 186, 187, 201, 210, 213, 214, 216, 227, 230, 234, 236, 238, 241, 248, 253, 254, 287, 345, 358, 360, 364, 371, 374, 382, 391, 395, 407, 408, 414, 418, 422, 423, 427, 440, 442, 449, 450, 470, 474, 478, 484, 487, 488, 490, 511, 519, 521, 533, 549, 552, 559, 572, 582.

V

A last phase in the analysis of the hymn texts deals with eschatological subjects—the second coming of Christ, the signs concerning his advent, the resurrection, and everlasting life. In an earlier place in the collection (294-299) there are hymns under the rubric "Burial of the Dead." On the other hand, while there are hymns suitable for the resurrection and the last judgment, there is no rubric designating them as such. Yet there are rubrics on conflict and victory, comfort and rest, everlasting life and commemoration. This seems a radical departure in practice.

Inasmuch as the collection reflects an emphasis on the quasi-Christian and quasi-Platonic notion of the immortality of the soul which has generally been dominant in Roman Catholic theology rather than in Lutheran, this portion should be considered carefully. Certainly

Lutheran theology is more in harmony with the forthright declaration of the Creed which is part of the regular service of worship, "I believe . . . the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting," than with any notion of disembodied souls in paradise.

Under the rubric "Life Everlasting" is the hymn of Isaac Watts, "There Is a Land of Pure Delight" (583). This is fine poetry, but it is so redolent with figures of speech from the Old Testament and so lacking in Christian content that it could be sung in a synagogue or at a lodge funeral and cause neither offense nor controversy. This is followed by "Jerusalem the Golden" (584), which is probably the finest and most artistic example of heavenly homesickness in existence.

While no one would want to rob believing Christians of the measure of comfort in certain hymns dealing with everlasting life, the compilers seem unaware of the emphasis of Lutheranism, which has always placed greater emphasis on the end of history, the coming of Christ, and the judgment of God through Jesus Christ than attempts to describe in metaphorical speech the city of God with its pearly gates and pleasant walks. In addition, there is a tendency to place too great an emphasis on the reward which God bestows upon believers through Jesus Christ. On the other hand, "Thy Word, O God, Declareth" (585) has a good evangelical emphasis. The next hymn "The World is Very Evil" (586) is an excellent hymn of the Middle Ages, though the studied artfulness of Neale's translation would seem to make it acceptable only to the effete. The common man will find only a few hymns that he can really understand in this section of the book.[16]

Since "Jerusalem the Golden" (584) was placed in the collection, there seems to be little reason for "Jerusalem my Happy Home" (587), particularly when consideration is given to the following stanza:

Quite through the streets with silver sound
The flood of life doth flow,
Upon whose banks on every side
The wood of life doth grow.

"Jerusalem, Thou City Fair and High" (588) is an excellent

16 The rubric called "Life Everlasting" might have been strengthened if "I Know of a Sleep in Jesus' Name" (299) had been placed there.

hymn, though it makes young persons singing it say they desire more than they likely do. Unfortunately the Christocentric character of the hymn has been weakened by the omission of some stanzas. The next two hymns (589, 590) lay too much stress, in the writer's opinion, on heaven. For those who try to follow the teachings of the Gospel and not Greek anthropology, "Forever with the Lord" (590) is particularly obnoxious.

Here in the body pent,
Absent from him I roam
Yet nightly pitch my moving tent
A day's march nearer home.

The next hymn, "Light's Abode, Celestial Salem" (591), is replete with elaborate word patters and contains these questionable lines:

Now with gladness, now with courage,
Bear the burden on thee laid
That hereafter these thy labors
May with endless gifts be paid
And in everlasting glory
Thou with brightness be arrayed.

It would seem to be hypercritical to attempt to demythologize "There's a Friend for Little Children" (592), and nothing will be said about it. Perhaps enough has been said about sub-Christian hymns, and little need be said about "I Know Not What the Future Hath" (593). At best it seems like a New England replica of "Beautiful Isle of Somewhere." The next three hymns (594, 597, 598) to be considered have references "within the veil" which assume knowledge of the Old Testament but evidence little New Testament content. Critical persons have called to the writer's attention the line reading

With harpers harping on their harps
To him that sat thereon (597).

Objections also have been raised in regard to the word pattern in "O What Their Joy and Their Glory Must Be" (596), particularly to the

t of Trinitarian eisegesis which must be a source of amusement to .e clergyman and of mystery to the layman.

Low before him with our praise we fall
Of whom, and in whom, and through whom are all;
Of whom, the Father; and in whom, the Son;
Through whom, the Spirit, with them ever One.

With the exception of two doxologies (601, 602), the collection oses with a hymn by the Unitarian Hosmer "O Lord of Life, Where'er hey Be" (600), which might be used at the Eastern Star as well as any synagogue.

It is almost unbelievable that there was not sufficient pressure from onservative Lutherans to include the great hymn "Alle Menschen üssen sterben."[17] Or if the hymnal was to be representative, with ontributions from all sorts and conditions of men, from a midwestern armer (80) to one of high degree, then the hymn of Countess Emilie uliana of Schwartzburg-Rudolstadt, "Wer weiss wie nahe mir mein nde," should be included.[18] Certainly strong hymns that put the fear f death and God into men's hearts ought not to be overlooked while ymns weak and vacillating, couched in a language that laymen cannot nderstand, are added to the collection.

It is not the work of an hour or a day to revise a hymnbook, articularly if one consults congregations to learn their needs and esires. The Lutheran Church has no need of a "congregation of sacred tes" which seeks only to provide liturgical materials to "raise standrds" of worship beyond the level of the average congregation. The ther extreme, which would make its sole appeal to the popular taste f the lower levels of parishioners, is not advocated. Perhaps the aparently forgotten dictum, *in media veritas,* needs to be reconsidered.

17 The layman could understand this forthright hymn better than lines like this: *O happy, oly portion, Refection for the blest* (586). Only those who have eaten in a refectory know hat "refection" is.

18 In English, "Who Knows How Near My Life's Expended." In different translations, it is ound in a variety of Lutheran hymnals.

The Formation of the Lutheran General Synod, South, During the Civil War

By Gordon W. Ward, Jr.

THE major schisms which occurred in American Churches in the nineteenth century grew out of the Negro slavery question, which became a source of increasing agitation and political tension. Some groups, such as the Congregational Churches, lacked sufficient representation in the southern states or were too loosely organized to create North-South schisms within those bodies. The churches most affected were those most widely distributed throughout North and South—the Baptist, the Methodist, and the Presbyterian. By 1860, each of these denominations had divided into a northern and a southern branch. The Baptists separated in May, 1845, when delegates representing eight slaveholding states convened in Augusta, Georgia, and organized the Southern Baptist Convention. In the same month of that year, 1845, after a slaveholding bishop from Georgia was given the choice of forfeiting his office or the slaves, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was formed. The Presbyterians, already divided into a New School body and an Old School body, had two separate schisms. The United Synod of the South became the southern counterpart of the New School body. Delegates from the Old School synods and presbyteries in the Confederate States formed the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America.

Of the major Protestant bodies, only the Lutheran Church remained intact; but with the trend in political conditions in the 1860's, the spirit of sectionalism became apparent within this body also. This is reflected in a resolution passed by the North Carolina Synod at its annual meeting in May, 1860, suggesting the publication of a Lutheran church paper in the South:

> Whereas, we regard the publication of a weekly Church Paper as highly important and necessary to meet the wants of our Church at the South, and the interests of our Southern Educational enterprises; and whereas, in the establishment of such

paper, it is important to its success, that the confidence and support of the whole urch in the South be secured; and whereas, we regard some point in our state a central locality and advantageous in other respects; therefore resolved, that committee of three be appointed to confer with a similar committee from the nods of South Carolina and West Virginia, in regard to the location and estab- hment of a Southern paper.[1]

hough this reflects a southern consciousness, there is no reference to e developing political situation or to the North as such. In the South arolina Synod, on the other hand, there was in that same year definite vareness of and concern for political conditions. Typical of several solutions that were passed is this one that was offered by the Rev. . A. Bolles: "The Evangelical Lutheran Synod of South Carolina, aving met in the town of Newberry, to consult together for the terests and prosperity of our beloved Zion, would respectfully and evoutly suggest to the Churches under our care, not only to remember ie low estate of the Christian Church in their prayers, but also to emember the present 'confused' and 'divided' state of our beloved ountry politically."[2]

An editorial appearing in *The Lutheran Observer* during Decem- er, 1860, expressed the following northern concern over conditions a the church: "What the effect of this agitation will be upon the Lu- heran church south, we cannot yet positively know. The state of South arolina 'has seceded from the Union,' and we fear that if not im- nediately, it will before long produce a division in our church. Thus ar, our church has not been distracted, the subject of slavery having een properly excluded from our ecclesiastical councils; but whether his will be possible hereafter is exceedingly doubtful."[3] This state- ient is quite significant, not only because it reflects a similar concern n the North over the state of the church but also because it alludes o what was to become a significant difference between the Lutheran chism as it developed and the division within other Protestant bodies, amely, the noticeable absence of slavery as a primary cause of gitation.

1 *Minutes,* Lutheran Synod of North Carolina, 1860, pp. 12, 13.
2 *Minutes,* Lutheran Synod and Ministerium of South Carolina and Adjacent States, 1860, 26.
3 "The Interest of the Church in the Questions which Agitate the Country" (editorial), *he Lutheran Observer,* December 28, 1860 (pages not numbered).

Though political differences were beginning to show themselves in 1860, the Lutheran Church remained united in organization and of one mind in doctrine. There was general concern in the North and the South, but no signs of the bitterness seen in other church bodies. The following year, however, was marked by deeper concern and stronger sectional loyalties. *The Lutheran Observer,* boasting a "circulation larger than that of all the other papers combined, which are published in the Lutheran Church,"[4] still had a wide circulation in the South, as seen by the following list of post offices registering subscribers:

Alabama	7	Arkansas	1
California	1	Canada West	6
Connecticut	1	Delaware	2
District of Columbia	2	Florida	7
Georgia	36	Iowa	128
Illinois	191	India	2
Indiana	230	Kansas	11
Kentucky	21	Louisiana	4
Maryland	118	Massachusetts	3
Michigan	16	Mississippi	21
Missouri	44	Minnesota	15
Nebraska	3	New Jersey	42
New York	190	North Carolina	58
Nova Scotia	2	Ohio	381
Pennsylvania	728	South Carolina	65
Tennessee	23	Texas	12
Utah	2	Virginia	198
Wisconsin	18	TOTAL	2,589[5]

Twelve days after the fall of Fort Sumter, this paper in an editorial expressed its hope for peace while avoiding any reference to Union loyalty or antagonism toward the South:

> Whatever difference of opinion there may exist among Christian men, they are surely all united in desiring an amicable adjustment of our present difficulties. . . O that God would bring us deliverance from trouble and restore peace to our unhappy country. We trust all parties will pause on the brink, and hearken to the voice of conscience, and the Gospel of the Son of God.[6]

4 *The Lutheran Observer,* May 3, 1861.
5 *Loc. cit.*
6 "Civil War" (editorial), *ibid.,* April 26, 1861.

The conciliatory spirit reflected in *The Lutheran Observer* was due in part to the geographical position of this paper's place of publication in the state of Maryland. Regarding this, an editorial appearing on May 10 made the following observation: ". . . a very large majority of the State are for the Union. The stanchest advocates of state rights are said to look upon secession as utterly impracticable, and this no doubt has influenced large numbers in favor of the Union. . . . In a week or two the position of Maryland will be definitely decided."[7] Because it was somewhat noncommittal during the early months of 1861, *The Lutheran Observer* came under attack from the more patriotic periodical, *The Missionary* (published in Pittsburgh in 1861 and later changed to *Lutheran and Missionary*), which spoke of the "disloyalty of the *Observer* to the Constitution and the Union."[8] The *Observer*, while clarifying its position as a loyal supporter of the Constitution and Union in the face of such accusations, at the same time continued to plead for reconciliation and unity, especially in the church:

> What necessity, nay, what excuse could there be for a disruption of our church? There can be none. The Catholic church, the Moravian church, and the Episcopal church will remain united, and shall it be said that the Lutheran church has so much more of the earthly, and so much less of the divine in her structure and membership than these, that her Synods and congregations cannot remain a unit? No, this cannot, must not be said of us, and we trust the law of spiritual affinity which the Gospel has set in motion, will continue to act with undiminished force, and hold us all in union with Christ and with each other. . . . We could not consent to its [i.e., the church's] disruption unless its members were in open and irreconcilable warfare with each other. Is there ought of this in our church? Most assuredly not, for in all our ecclesiastical affairs we have known no antagonisms between north or south, east or west. There has been no conflict between our northern and southern Synods or churches, and we of the middle states have always been living in fraternal fellowship with each other. It may be truly affirmed, that there is no feeling of hatred or alienation felt by one part of the church toward another, and there can therefore be no motive or ground for division. . . . If the present disorders in the body politic should evolve issues which may demand church legislation, let us wait until those issues are upon us, and in the meantime be true to each other, and unite heartily in sustaining all those enterprises which are intimately identified with the stability and progress of our church. . . . Our hopes of the church demand a continued and vital union of all her parts or sections.[9]

7 "The Critical Position of Maryland" (editorial), *ibid.*, May 10, 1861.
8 "Loyalty to the Union" (editorial), *ibid.*, May 17, 1861.
9 "Will Our Church Be Divided?" (editorial), *ibid.*, May 17, 1861.

Besides the general spirit shown by this plea, of special importance is the description of complete ecclesiastical harmony between the various sections of the church. But it is impossible to give full acceptance to this without first examining the development of synodical opinion during this time.

The North Carolina Synod was the first southern synod to meet in 1861. After hearing the report of President Simon Scherer on the condition of the country and the church, the delegates unanimously adopted the following preamble and resolutions which were presented by Prof. D. H. Bittle and concerned the relation of the North Carolina Synod to the General Synod:

Whereas, In the distracted condition of our once happy country we deem it impracticable to send our delegates to the next meeting of the General Synod about to convene at Lancaster, Pennsylvania; and feeling that other Synods South are in a similar situation with this body, therefore:

Resolved, That we recommend a convention of all Southern delegates to the General Synod to meet at Salisbury, North Carolina, on Thursday preceding the third Sabbath in May 1862, for the purpose of endorsing the proceedings of the next meeting of the General Synod if practicable; otherwise to take such steps as may best promote the future harmony and propriety of that portion of the Church represented by the absent delegates.

Resolved, That we hereby commission our present delegates to the General Synod to attend the said convention.

Resolved, That the Corresponding Secretary of this body be instructed to inform all our Synods in the South of this action and ask their co-operation.[10]

Though this resolution was the product of practical necessity resulting from the dangerous political situation, it nevertheless helped to set the stage for later events.

Turning to some of the leading synods of the North, their records reveal a growing sense of nationalism and bitterness toward the South. In his annual report, the president of the New York Ministerium, Henry A. Pohlman, expressed this growing national pride:

The conflict between light and darkness must always produce more or less of strife and contention; and the duty of the church under these circumstances is obvious and ought to be clearly expressed. I rejoice in the expressions which have

10 *Minutes*, Lutheran Synod of North Carolina, 1861, p. 12.

en already given by the different synods which have been convened since this atter has been brought to the arbitrament of the sword; I glory in the fact that e descendants of Luther's countrymen have borne no mean part in the battle the Union, the Constitution, and the laws. . . . I trust that the Evangelical utheran Ministerium of the state of New York will not hesitate to give its stimony for the encouragement of the desponding, and to strengthen the hands d hearts of those who have harnessed themselves to the battle for the preserva- n of our precious inheritance in this perilous crisis of our country's history.[11]

spired by President Pohlman's report, the Rev. J. L. Schoock pre- nted the following preamble and resolutions which were adopted by e convention:

Whereas, A considerable portion of the citizens of the United States of nerica have risen up in rebellion against the constituted authorities of the land, r the purpose of permanently separating from the Union, and establishing an dependent Southern Confederacy; and

Whereas, We believe that this rebellion is utterly causeless, wicked, and rocious, and instigated and carried on by disappointed politicians, and ambitious magogues, who have been, and still are deluding and demoralizing the people the grossest misrepresentations and the vilest falsehoods; and

Whereas, We are firmly persuaded that the suppression of this rebellion is cessary, not only to the permanent prosperity of this nation and our continued joyment of those great principles of civil and religious freedom upon which ir government is founded, but to the interests and hopes of humanity every- here; therefore

Resolved, 1. That in its determination to crush out this rebellion as speedily possible, and maintain at every hazard and any cost the constitution and the ws, the government has our cordial approbation and unqualified confidence, and at in our estimation no concession or compromise should be made or entertained til its supremacy over all the states is reestablished and acknowledged—until s glorious banner waves again in triumph upon every rampart from which it as been stricken by the traitor's hand.

Resolved, 2. That we deem it to be in strict harmony with sound Christianity, s well as with true patriotism, to stand by the government and to exert all the fluence which God has given us, to aid it in its arduous and praiseworthy efforts vindicate its power, and to maintain its authority. . . .[12]

imilar resolutions were passed by the East Pennsylvania and the ew Jersey Synods. Two of the New Jersey Synod's resolutions read

11 *Minutes*, Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of the State of New York and djacent States and Countries, 1861, p. 65.
12 *Ibid.*, pp. 42-44.

as follows: "Resolved, that the safest, shortest and cheapest way to peace is, by the most thorough and energetic prosecution of the war, until those who have raised a standard against their country's flag lay down their arms and submit themselves to the constitution and the laws. Resolved, that we look with compassion on our deluded brethren at the South and most earnestly pray our common God and Father to show them the error of their ways and lead them to cheerfully submit to the 'powers that be.' "[13]

Attitudes in the Maryland Synod and in the Melanchthon Synod (located in Maryland) continued to be conciliatory in nature, showing general concern for the divided state of the church and the country, but not placing the blame on one side to the exclusion of the other. Maryland's unique position, geographically and politically, gave her an overall perspective and concern which is seen in none of the other states, North or South. This was accompanied by a genuine sense of involvement and responsibility. President Startzman, speaking to the Melanchthon Synod in September 1861, admonished them with these words: "It becomes us, prayerfully to inquire how much we may have contributed either directly, or indirectly, in bringing about this state of things, sincerely to repent of our past shortcomings and earnestly to invoke divine interposition in our behalf that the hand of devastation and death may soon be stayed. . . ."[14] A similar statement was made the next month by President A. J. Weddell in speaking to the Maryland Synod: "As Christians, it becomes us to humble ourselves deeply before our God, to confess our own sins and the sins of our nation, that the Almighty may turn aside from his wrath and remove the rod of his sore judgments from our guilty land."[15] Efforts to unite the Maryland, Virginia, and Melanchthon Synods had to be abandoned after the joint committee investigating the possibilities of such a merger reported that they had "found a large majority of both Synods [i.e. Maryland and Virginia] opposed to such a project."[16] In 1860 the Virginia and Maryland Synods had both looked with some favor upon the

13 *Minutes,* Lutheran Synod of New Jersey, 1861, p. 12.
14 *Minutes,* Melanchthon Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, 1861, p. 4.
15 *Proceedings,* Lutheran Synod of the State of Maryland, 1861, p. 4.
16 *Ibid.,* p. 10.

consummation of such a union, but this had been "nullified by the present state of affairs in our country."[17]

Southern Lutherans were becoming increasingly more self-conscious and apprehensive of their northern brethren. This is seen most clearly in their attitude toward the increasingly obvious pro-northern stand of *The Lutheran Observer*. In an editorial which appeared in this paper in May 1861 it was stated: "Hence we are for the Union, and nothing else, nothing additional, and we are in favor of all constitutional means to perpetuate it inviolate. We cannot and will not be a citizen of any other country but the United States; and if Maryland should secede, of which, however, we have no fear, we should forthwith sell out our property, no matter at what sacrifice, and locate where we could still live under the 'stars and stripes,' and boast of being a free born citizen of the United States. Will this satisfy brother Passavant [editor of *The Missionary*] and his correspondents that we are loyal?"[18] Southern reaction to this and similar editorials can be seen in these excerpts from letters addressed to the editor. The first came from a minister in Georgia: "I now say that if the Lutherans of the north hold the views presented in the Observer, there is an absolute, and inevitable necessity for a division. I look upon the secession of the Southern States as the grandest, most noble, and chivalrous, patriotic, and God-like achievement ever effected by any oppressed people in the world. I thank God that I am permitted to behold this movement. . . . I have fully espoused the cause of the Confederate States, and am ready to sacrifice my life upon their altar. I despise the Old Union—I detest the stars and stripes. . . ."[19] Another letter from "an aged and godly minister"[20] had this to say concerning the paper: "Dear br:— After having long abstained from politics, I was pained that for sometime the proprietors of the *Lutheran Observer* have consented that their sheet should thus be prostituted. Some of the editorials are intolerable, and insulting to southern men. . . ."[21] Dr. Bittle, president

17 *Loc. cit.*
18 "Reflections on the Crisis" (editorial), *The Lutheran Observer*, May 31, 1861.
19 *The Lutheran Observer*, June 7, 1861.
20 *Ibid.*
21 *Ibid.*

of Roanoke College in Salem, Virginia, wrote these words which were printed in the *Observer*:

It is a matter of life and death with us—our homes, the virtue of our wives and daughters, and our all is at stake in this terrible struggle, and yet you send the Observer with its influence, as far as it goes, against us. Great God Almighty, do you wish to make our church paper an instrument to assist in our extermination? . . . I think it very hard in you, when we are your brethren, and yet a united church, that you should array the Observer against us right at a time when we expect the bloodiest struggle that was ever witnessed on this continent. I think the neutral position of Maryland should induce you to use your influence, irrespective of party feelings, to produce peace. . . .[22]

These southern protests, however, had no effect on the attitude expressed by the paper. It remained pro-Union, and if anything increased in its hostility to the South. Characteristic of this increased hostility was an editorial appearing in June, 1861:

Among the many delusions which have seized our southern brethren, none will prove more disastrous than the belief that a large number of people in the loyal states sympathize with them in their rebellion, and will give them aid and comfort. . . . Some of our ministers in the seceded states still entertain the idea that the Observer misrepresents the feelings of the church in the loyal states, and that our people do not willingly support the war against the conspirators of Montgomery. . . . The time for compromise is past, the nation is thoroughly roused, and there is a deep and abiding conviction and a holy purpose to crush out this rebellion so thoroughly, that the serpent of civil discord may never lift its head. . . . If it would sweep away every dollar that we have, if it would sink the Observer to the bottom of the ocean, we would shroud it in the flag of the Union and go down joyfully, if by so doing we could nerve one arm and sustain one heart in defense of that Government which we love next to our God.[23]

By the end of June, 1861, *The Lutheran Observer* had lost all of its southern subscribers.[24] By September those who had fought to maintain the unity of the church began to prepare themselves for the worst. An organizational schism in the Lutheran Church now seemed un-

22 *Ibid.*

23 "Are You Sustained in Your Position by the Church?" (editorial), *The Lutheran Observer*, June 21, 1861.

24 *The Lutheran Observer*, June 21, 1861.

avoidable. Still united in doctrine and practice, with a common confessional heritage which would appear to be a strong tie, Lutherans had finally been drawn into the political struggle. The question was whether ecclesiastical unity would win out over political disunity. A growing national pride in the North and growing confederate pride in the South were apparent within Lutheranism. This was coupled with several concrete happenings which became bricks in the wall of decision, so to speak. As early as May, 1861, as was stated earlier, the North Carolina Synod voted not to send delegates to the twentieth convention of the General Synod, scheduled to meet that very month. Instead, it recommended a convention of southern delegates. About the same time officers of the General Synod, considering the unsettled state of the country, voted to postpone indefinitely the twentieth convention.[25] Then there was the failure in the attempt to unite the Melanchthon, Maryland, and Virginia Synods. Finally, there were the resolutions passed by northern synods and the increasing pro-Union attitude of *The Lutheran Observer,* all of which led southern Lutherans to think more and more in terms of their own institutions, publications, and separate organization. The Lutherans appeared to be following the pattern set earlier by other major Protestant denominations, with one exception. Slavery had remained in the background throughout the entire controversy thus far. This fact was recognized in an editorial appearing in the *Observer*: "Not the General Synod, nor any district Synod, nor any Conference, nor single congregation of our church, has ever remotely interfered with slavery. Even during periods of deepest agitation the subject has not been "named" in our ecclesiastical assemblies. . . . No other religious denomination in the United States has stood so entirely aloof from the slavery agitation as the Lutheran—none has dealt with slaveholders so kindly—none is so innocent of producing causes of the war."[26]

The year 1861 was not to end without the threatened division in the Lutheran Church becoming a reality. Those who in September

25 The temptation is strong to speculate as to what may have been the final outcome if the meeting had taken place as scheduled. Would there have been a southern delegation present? If so, would the convention have been successful in healing the growing breach, or would this personal confrontation have served only to crystalize the differences and increase the possibility of a permanent schism?

26 "Letter From Philadelphia—The 'Southern' Lutherans and Their Organ," *The Lutheran Observer,* September 27, 1861.

sensed that Lutheran disunity was inevitable saw their fear become a reality when the Virginia Synod convened at Mt. Tabor, Augusta County, Virginia, in October. President J. P. Cline opened the meeting on a serious note:

> Since our last synodical meeting, twelve months ago, some of the most important events that can befall a nation have transpired. Twelve of the Southern States have seceded from the United States Government. As that Government is attempting to bring back said states into the Union, a civil war has ensued, which has convulsed our whole land—has already cost many valuable lives, and brought distress into numerous families. The interests of the Church have, as a natural consequence, been seriously affected by this political revolution. Some of our ministers, and a large number of our laymen are now in the army; and some of our clerical brethren, who reside near the border of our State will find it inconvenient, if not impracticable, to meet with us at this time. In consequence of the unusual excitement throughout the land, public worship has been in most localities but sparsely attended, but a small number added to the Church; and it is to be feared that little good has been accomplished; and, hence, that only meagre parochial reports may be anticipated from our Pastors.[27]

Following his report on conditions prevailing in the church, President Cline presented his first recommendation, ". . . that we withdraw our connection from the General Synod of the United States." He followed this with three further recommendations: "That we patronize to the utmost of our ability, the 'Southern Lutheran,' which has been generously started by our Brethren of the South Carolina Synod. That we appoint delegates to attend the proposed Convention in Salisbury, North Carolina, on the Thursday preceding the third Sabbath in May next, for the purpose of organizing a Southern United, or General Synod. That we unite our energies with those of the other Evangelical Lutheran Synods, in building up Theological and Literary institutions of the South."[28]

Later in the agenda the Committee on the President's Report presented its resolutions, and through these the president's position was supported and strengthened. "Resolved, That we are fully persuaded that the present defensive war, maintained by us against an invading foe, is 'just' and 'righteous,' and much as we deplore the carnage and

27 *Minutes,* Lutheran Synod of Virginia, 1861, p. 4.
28 *Ibid.,* p. 5.

emoralizing tendencies of war, yet believing, in the language of our ble Confession, that 'Christians may wage just wars and serve in em'—we heartily approve of the conduct of our brethren thus serv- g in our Confederate army, and confidently appeal to the Supreme uler of nations to judge between us and our enemies."[29]

Concerning the recommendation to separate from the General ynod, the committee presented resolutions which, like the preceding esolution, were unanimously approved.

Whereas it is manifest to us—in view of the final disruption of the former Jnited States," the hostile attitude of those yet adhering to the remaining un- rupulous despotism at Washington, and the uncharitable and intolerant spirit d bearing of many of those whom we once esteemed as "brethren in the same ith"—that the interests of our church, loyalty to our Government, as well as e promptings of self-respect, imperatively demand that we should at once dis- lve all ecclesiastical alliance with them; Therefore

1. Resolved, That we do hereby withdraw our connection with the "General ynod of the United States," and earnestly favor the organization of a "General ynod of the Confederate States. . . ."

he other resolutions called for the election of delegates at that session attend the convention in Salisbury, support of *The Southern Lu- eran,* and united efforts in the establishment and sustaining of theo- gical and literary institutions "for our Southern Zion."[30]

When the South Carolina Synod met in January, 1862,[31] it fol- wed the example set by Virginia. Once again the president of the ynod, this time E. B. Hort, made the initial suggestion. The following an excerpt from his report: "The war which has prevented your ppointed delegates from attending the General Synod, has so effectually eparated us from a large number of those who composed it, that it nders another organization necessary for the benefit of our Southern urches. The appointment of the same or other delegates to a Conven- on in Salisbury, to which we are invited by the Synod of North Caro- na, will doubtless meet your approbation. A happy union of our

29 *Ibid.,* p. 10.
30 *Ibid.,* pp. 10, 11.
31 The annual synodical convention which was to have been held in 1861 was postponed, e to war conditions, until 1862, when it met January 16-20 in St. Paul's Church, Newberry istrict, South Carolina.

Southern Churches is anticipated, and we will trust to God for th result."[32] The Committee on the President's Address requested "som declaration annulling our former connection with the General Syno of the United States." In response to this request the conventio unanimously adopted the following resolutions, prepared by Dr. Joh Bachman, a leading Lutheran pastor in Charleston, South Carolina:

Whereas, the duty of rendering obedience to rulers and magistrates, as thos ordained by God for the exercise of justice and the maintenance of order, is en joined in the Word of God: *And whereas,* After years of injustice and oppressio in palpable violation of the Constitution of the United States, inflicted on thes Southern States by the former Government of the United States, these State seceded and formed a Government under the name of the Confederate States America, therefore,

Resolved, That we recognize the hand of God in the wisdom of those council and the heroism of our brave defenders, which have enabled us to form a govern ment of our choice.

Resolved, That we recognize the right of these States in having seceded an formed an independent government, to which our undivided allegiance is due.

Whereas, This Synod was formerly connected with the General Synod o the United States of America, in which we are represented by delegates, we hav now arrived at the solemn conviction that it is essential to the good of our churc and the glory of God, that the Evangelical Lutheran Churches of these Con federate States withdraw all connection with the Northern General Synod, an by this solemn and unanimous act declare our connection as a Synod dissolved.

Resolved, That we are in favor of forming a General Synod of the Confed erate States on the basis of the Augsburg Confession, and that our delegates electe to the Convention, to be held in Salisbury, North Carolina, in this month, b empowered to vote for such an organization.

Resolved, That in the event of the formation of a Southern General Synod our delegates be empowered to represent us in that Synod.[33]

The South Carolina Synod was instrumental from the beginning i establishing *The Southern Lutheran.* The following extract from th report of the editing committee elicited a synodical pledge for suppor of that enterprise, especially now that an independent southern churc was being seriously considered.

From the very commencement of our struggle for political independence an separate national existence, in which the Lutheran, in common with all the othe

32 *Minutes,* Lutheran Synod and Ministerium of South Carolina and Adjacent State 1862, p. 6.

33 *Ibid.,* p. 24.

urches in these Confederate States deeply sympathizes, it became apparent that paper would be needed as the channel of communication between the church our connection and as the medium for the dissemination of our doctrinal views.[34] The Lutheran Observer," which we had been accustomed to regard as the organ our Southern church, though published in a Southern State, had not only andoned our cause, but had actually joined with the religious and secular press the North in denouncing us as "traitors and rebels," and in calling upon the ederal Government to send forth its armies for our subjugation. Under such rcumstances it was but natural that we should turn from it with aversion and sgust, and desire the establishment of a paper that would be introduced into the mily circle and be read by our people generally without the fear of having their elings outraged by opprobrious epithets and uncharitable remarks. . . .[35]

In May the North Carolina Synod followed in the steps of Virnia and South Carolina by adopting the Bachman resolutions.[36] Folwing this, three clerical and three lay delegates were elected to repreit the synod at the convention to be held in Salisbury.

What was the reaction of the northern periodicals to these developents? The following is taken from an editorial appearing in *The Lueran and Missionary* in April, 1862: "The time will come, if it has ot yet come, when the members of the Virginia Synod will mourn over ie delusion—the fearful night-mare of distortion and passion under hich they have been lying, and they would then give much to recall hat they have put on record against themselves, and against the orious Union from which their hearts have been turned. Our prayer , that a State we love so dearly may speedily be redeemed from her atal error, and from the wretchedness it has brought upon her."[37] *The utheran Observer* described the Virginia Synod convention as that hich "claims to be religious, but in very truth and deed is 'not'—but , on the contrary, immoral, contradictory, and absurd, and calculated bring religion into dishonor and disrepute."[38] In speaking of the

34. This cannot be taken, however, to imply doctrinal differences between the northern and uthern branches of the church.

35 *Minutes,* Lutheran Synod and Ministerium of South Carolina and Adjacent States, 62, p. 20.

36 *Minutes,* Lutheran Synod of North Carolina, 1862, p. 17.

37. "A Chronicle for the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Virginia" (editorial), *The Lutheran d Missionary,* April 24, 1862, p. 102.

38 "Letter From Philadelphia—Meeting of the General Synod," *The Lutheran Observer,* ay 2, 1862.

decision of the Virginia Synod to separate from the General Synod, th following comments were among those used:

The Synod claims to be a religious body—its members claim to be religious—the purposes of their meeting were professedly religious—and withal, such an other budget of fallacies, falsehoods, and absurdities, it would be difficult to con coct. They literally "out-herod Herod." . . .

They "withdrew their connection from the General Synod of the Unite States." Why? It is not alleged that said Synod has done them any harm! It i not pretended that, as a body, or through any of its members, it has ever interfere with slavery! It is not even affirmed, that it has, directly or indirectly, counselle or approved the war, for it has not been in session since the war prevails! [Th General Synod was in session when this article appeared.] They declare, tha this, on 'their' part is a "defensive" war, and has been "forced upon the south fo the preservation of its liberties and rights." This, in the face of the world-know fact, that southern traitors and demagogues plotted this war 'years ago.' . . .[39]

This northern accusation against the Confederacy and the southern Lutheran church was finally made official when the General Synod met on May 1, 1862, in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. There were twenty-seven synods represented, with a ratio of about three clergymen to two laymen. As might well be expected, the major southern synods were not represented.[40] Only two southern delegates were listed: "Rev. W. G. Harter of the Synod of Kentucky, and Rev. Prof. Eggers of the Synod of Southern Illinois, but residing at Nashville."[41] The following report of the Committee on the State of the Country was discussed and adopted:

Whereas, Our beloved country, after having long been favored with a degree of political and religious freedom, security and prosperity, unexampled in the history of the world, now finds itself involved in a bloody war to suppress an armed rebellion against its lawfully constituted Government; and whereas, the Word of God, which is the sole rule of our faith and practice, requires loyal subjection to "the powers that be," because they are ordained by God, to be a terror to evil doers, and a praise to those who do well, and at the same time declares, that they who "resist the power" shall receive to themselves condemnation; and whereas, we, the representatives of the Evangelical Lutheran Synods in the United States

39 *Loc. cit.*

40 *Proceedings,* General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States, 1862, pp. 3-7.

41 *Minutes,* Lutheran Ministerium of the State of New York and Adjacent States and Countries, 1862, p. 31.

onnected with the General Synod, assembled in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, recog-ize it as our duty to give public expression to our convictions of truth on this ubject, and in every proper way to co-operate with our fellow citizens in sustain-ıg the great interests of law and authority, of liberty and righteousness, be it herefore

Resolved, That it is deliberate judgment of this synod, that the rebellion gainst the constitutional Government of this land is most wicked in its incep-ion, unjustifiable in its cause, unnatural in its character, inhuman in its prosecu-ion, oppressive in its aim, and destructive in its results to the highest interests f morality and religion.

Resolved, That, in the suppression of this rebellion and in the maintenance of ıe Constitution and the Union by the sword, we recognize the unavoidable necessity nd a sacred duty, which the Government owes to the nation and to the world, nd that therefore we call upon our people to lift up holy hands in power to ıe God of battles, without personal wrath against the evil doers on the one hand, nd without doubting the righteousness of our cause on the other, that He would ive wisdom to the President and his counsellors, and success to the army and avy, that our beloved land may speedily be delivered from treason and anarchy.

Resolved, That while we recognize this unhappy war as a righteous judgment f God, visited upon us because of the individual and national sins, of which we ave been guilty, we nevertheless regard this rebellion as more immediately the atural result of the continuance and spread of domestic slavery in our land, and herefore hail with unmingled joy the proposition of our Chief Magistrate, which as received the sanction of Congress, to extend aid from the General Govern-ıent to any State in which slavery exists, which shall deem fit to initiate a system f constitutional emancipation.

Resolved, That we deeply sympathize with all loyal citizens and Christian atriots in the rebellious portions of our country, and we cordially invite their ooperation, in offering united supplications at a Throne of Grace, that God would estore peace to our distracted country, reestablish fraternal relations between all ıe States, and make our land in all time to come, the asylum of the oppressed, nd the permanent abode of liberty and religion.

Resolved, That our devout thanks are due to Almighty God for the success which has crowned our arms, and while we praise and magnify his name for the elp and succor he has graciously afforded our land and naval forces, in enabling ıem to overcome our enemies, we regard these tokens of his divine favor, as heering indications of the final triumph of our cause.[42]

Besides this statement, two other resolutions were adopted, one con-emning those southern ministers and synods supporting the southern

42 *Proceedings,* General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States, 862, pp. 29-31.

cause, and the other expressing sympathy with Union supporters in the South:

Resolved, That this Synod cannot but express its most decided disapprobation of the course of those Synods and ministers, heretofore connected with this body, in the open sympathy and active co-operation, which they have given to the cause of treason and insurrection.

Resolved, That we deeply sympathize with our people in the Southern States, who, maintaining their proper Christian loyalty, have in consequence been compelled to suffer persecution and wrong, and we hail with pleasure the near approach of their deliverance and restoration to our Christian and ecclesiastical fellowship.[43]

The General Synod had made its position unquestionably clear. The southern church now had no choice but to betray its loyalty to the Confederacy or to organize independently. It was already quite clear that it would take the latter of the two alternatives, choosing to remain loyal to the southern cause and thereby alienating itself completely from the General Synod. The door was now closed for any hope of reconciliation. Ecclesiastical unity had been sacrificed on the altar of political disunity.

One thing further is to be noted. Here, for the first time, the General Synod took a definite stand on the subject of slavery. After vigorous debate the General Synod passed the third resolution above, confident that it had taken a middle ground position between abolition and slavery. Actually, the resolution established the position of the General Synod as one of anti-slavery, though the expression of this anti-slavery sentiment was, to be sure, more moderate than that of some other Protestant church bodies. It now remained to see how the southern church would react to this injection of the slavery question into the controversy.

Before considering the reaction of the southern Lutherans, several of the editorial comments on the meeting of the General Synod deserve mention. The first of these appeared in *The Lutheran and Missionary* and referred to the resolutions adopted by the northern body: "They do honor to their authors, to the General Synod, and to our church,

43 *Ibid.*, p. 31.

nd are in happy contrast with the sad resolutions which came to us rom alienated brethren in the South, over whom, in spite of their ruel misrepresentation of us and of our beloved country, our very hearts leed in sorrow and pity; and for whose restoration to peace and happi- ness through a true penitence, the prayers of the whole Lutheran Church in the loyal States of the Union, are rising to God day and ight."[44] The same periodical had these comments to make concerning outhern representation at the General Synod:

> As to the idea that the Resolution was passed either because there was no outhern presence to intimidate, or Southern vote to put it down, it is preposterous. he South was represented, and nobly represented by some of her sons [see bove]. That she was not more largely represented was "her own fault"; for, lthough communication was not easy with large parts of the South, "that was ot the reason of the paucity of her representatives." The Southern Synods in dvance of any knowledge of such disability, had cut themselves off from the eneral Synod; and that is the true and only "reason" of their absence. And ere is the horn of the dilemma which must forever prevent the South from talk- ng as some men talk for her. Either the presence of the Southern delegations ould have prevented the General Synod from passing the resolution, or it would ot. If it would not, then it cannot be urged that the General Synod did what it ould not have done if the Southern delegation had been there. If it would, then, s the real reason of their non-appearance was their own voluntary sundering of hemselves, they are responsible for its passage. If they had wished and purposed o come, and could not, then a case with some plausibility might be made out or them.[45]

The southern synods now had the task of establishing themselves s a self-supporting and independent southern Lutheran church. Largely under the leadership of the Virginia Synod, a preliminary con- ention had been held at Salisbury, North Carolina, May 15, 1862. Only a few delegates were in attendance. Their primary task was to onsider the feasibility of forming a Southern General Synod. They ccomplished little more than to appoint a special committee to provide or a later convention, whose task it would be to formulate a constitu-

44 "Our General Synod on the State of the Country" (editorial), *The Lutheran and Missionary*, May 15, 1862, p. 114.

45 "The General Synod and Its Resolutions on the State of the Country" (editorial), *The Lutheran and Missionary*, July 3, 1862, p. 142.

tion, a formula of government and discipline, a hymn book, a catechism, and a liturgy.[46]

The organizational convention met at Concord, North Carolina, May 20-26, 1863. Delegates represented the synods of Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia.[47] The president of the preliminary convention, Rev. N. Aldrich, made the opening address. He spoke "concerning the grounds of separation from the northern section of the Church."[48] Among his remarks were the following:

> So far as sympathy and harmony of the section is concerned, the northern and southern portions of our Church have for years been divided. The prevailing spirit of the northern portion is a spirit of fanaticism, which has been nurtured and intensified until like a devouring flame it permeates all their religious, social and political relations. It brooks no restraint, and knows no interest beyond its own. That which it cannot convert to itself it endeavors to destroy, and glories in every opportunity to accomplish its wicked purpose.
>
> On the other hand the spirit of the southern portion is that of conservatism. We claim for ourselves nothing beyond that which reason and God's Word allow. While we have always cheerfully conceded to the northern Church the right to judge for themselves in matters of conscience, we at the same time have demanded that this privilege be extended to us. But how often has it been denied! And in the General Assemblies, how frequently of late had Christian courtesy been violated, and all the generous emotions of our nature mortified by the intemperate zeal of those in whom we confided as brethren of the same household of faith. And now that a cruel sanguinary war is waged against us by the government of the United States with a spirit of malignity, that disgraces our common humanity, so far from uttering a word of remonstrance, or protesting against its continuance, the Northern Church has actually gloried in these scenes of blood and carnage and by a formal resolution declared it to be a duty of the government to prosecute this war even to our subjugation.[49]

Upon hearing the president's report, the convention adopted the following resolution: "Resolved, That believing, as we do, 'the ground of separation,' as set forth in this report before us, to be substantially

46 Charles W. Heathcote, *The Lutheran Church and the Civil War* (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1919), p. 93.

47 *Ibid.*, pp. 93-94.

48 *Ibid.*, p. 94.

49 *Minutes*, General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the Confederate States of America, 1863, pp. 4, 5.

orrect in its statement, and an ample justification of our present action, hile we desire to indulge no unchristian bitterness or uncharitableness oward those from whom we have severed all ecclesiastical connection, e yet feel constrained solemnly to declare this withdrawal to be a nal act, and as making no provision for any renewal in the future of he intimate relations which have existed between the Northern and outhern sections of the Church in the past. 'How can two walk to-ether except they be agreed?' "[50] The break was complete. The central rganization of the Lutherans in the South was to be known as the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the Confederate tates of America." A doctrinal platform was adopted, as was a con-titution, resembling closely the constitution of the old General Synod. iturgical services were also approved, and a committee was appointed o prepare for the church a Book of Worship.[51]

Two very significant documents were appended to the minutes of his first convention. One of these set forth the reasons for organizing he General Synod, South. The following is an extract from that docu-ment:

Up to the commencement of this unnatural war the Lutheran Church was not divided. The fanaticism and abolitionism of the North had not divided her councils, nor driven her, as the other denominations were compelled to seek peace in separation. But it was only a question of time. Attempts have been made from time to time to introduce upon the floor of the General Synod, North, the very question that separated other denominations into North and South. If the previous history of the Lutheran Church does not prove the subject-matter under consideration, the last meeting of the General Synod, held in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, has assuredly settled the question. That ecclesiastical body, composed of the most influential Lutherans of the North, acknowledged and endorsed the unconstitutional acts of the Federal government; called and denounced secession as a crime, proclaimed through the Church that the defenders of liberty were rebels, insurgents, and solemnly declared and branded our southern brethren as traitors to man, to their government and to God. Hence we can never expect from them mercy or pardon, much less equal rights and privileges, unless we bow in submission to their opinions and denounce as wicked what we conscientiously believe to be just and right.[52]

50 *Ibid.*, p. 12.

51 *Minutes*, Lutheran Synod and Ministerium of South Carolina and Adjacent States, 1863, p. 10.

52 Appendix to *Minutes*, General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the Confederate States of America, 1863, quoted in Heathcote, *op. cit.*, pp. 96, 97.

The second document, "Expression on Slavery," included these words:

As the Church judicatory we find it [slavery] existing in our midst and only feel bound to regard the moral relations that exist between the master and the slave. If slavery be a sin, and in this respect only can the institution be a sin—the Church has the authority to call her members to account and legislate upon the subject. Sin is the transgression of the moral law. What divine law does slavery violate? No express command. No thus saith the Lord; not even the golden rule of our Redeemer: To do unto others as you would have them do unto you. Certainly no moral law or precept in the Mosaic economy, or God would not have given a command regulating the moral relations of master and servant in the decalogue, nor permitting slavery to exist among his ancient people, Israel. Certainly no moral law or precept in the Christian dispensation; or our Savior or His apostles would have denounced slavery, in express terms and have enumerated the sin in the catalogue of crimes mentioned. . . . The Word of God is the only rule to guide us in determining this question, and not the deductions of philosophy falsely so called, not the sophistical conclusions drawn from the abstract ideas of human freedom, nor the fanatical notion of those philanthropists who would be wise above what is written in the unerring record of truth.[53]

These two documents, together with the report of Mr. Aldrich and the resolution ensuing from that report, make it clear that to the Lutherans in the South separation from the northern brethren was not only desirable and justifiable but also inevitable. In the document on slavery, quoted above, they not only denounced the attitude of the General Synod, North, on slavery but they also expressed their approval of the institution.

The purpose of this study has not been to prove which side was right in the division of the Lutheran Church during the Civil War. If the author were to take a stand on this question, in spite of his southern background he would be inclined to consider it the unfortunate result of a complexity of circumstances involving guilt on both sides. The real purpose of the writer, however, has been to seek to determine the cause of the formation of the Lutheran General Synod, South, beginning with the tentative hypothesis that it was due to a combination of political and ecclesiastical differences. Some consideration was given to other denominational divisions in the same general

53 Heathcote, *op. cit.*, pp. 97, 98.

ime period for the purpose of drawing any comparisons or contrasts which might become evident.

What conclusions, if any, can now be drawn from the evidence? It has already been stated that the Lutheran Church was the last major Protestant body which split over the Civil War issue. It has also been observed that the slavery issue did not appear in the Lutheran picture until very late after the split was, for all practical intent, accomplished.

It must be said that the Lutherans, sharing a common political situation with other major Protestant denominations, finally succumbed to the pattern established by these other groups and allowed themselves to be drawn into the political arena where they had to choose sides against each other. The fact that this was the last of the great denominations to split may be attributed to several possible factors. Since the Protestant Reformation, the Lutherans were always careful to distinguish between the realm of the state and the realm of the church, both of which they believed were God-ordained, but each of which had its own peculiar function. Therefore it was much harder to involve the Lutheran Church in a controversy involving political and social issues which Lutherans believed were in the realm of the state, concerning citizens in their civil capacities and not in their ecclesiastical organizations. Coupled with this was the ethnic and religious unity which characterized the Lutheran Church. In spite of certain differences of opinion obtaining in the church with regard to doctrine, there was an essential unity in a common, historical, doctrinal position. It appears that this stronger doctrinal unity continued throughout the controversy and formed the basis for the reunion of the two groups in 1918.

When it is asked why slavery did not become a major issue in the Lutheran schism as it did in other major Protestant denominations, the answer is more difficult. Someone has suggested that a possible answer may be that Lutherans in the South were, by and large, non-slaveholding. This answer would find support in an editorial appearing in *The Lutheran and Missionary* in September, 1862: "When we remember that our Lutheran churches in the South, are as a class, to a less extent than any other, non-slaveholding, and that in the Border States which have clung to the Union, our people have been pre-eminent for their loyalty, we think we may safely assert that beyond any communion that has had a national extension, ours is free from the sin of

slavery and the taint of secession."[54] It is true that most of the Lutherans in the South settled in the valleys of Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, where there were fewer slaves than in other sections of those states. It is a fact, however, that southern Lutherans did own slaves. Though no parochial reports appeared in the minutes of the North Carolina or Virginia Synod, the minutes of the South Carolina Synod did carry such parochial reports, breaking the congregational statistics down into "white" and "colored." The "colored" figure is an indication of the presence of slaves. Thus in the 1860 minutes of the South Carolina Synod, out of the forty-eight congregations reporting there was a total of 4,056 communing whites and 952 communing colored.[55]

Probably a more likely explanation for the scant reference to slavery during the Lutheran controversy can be found in the social ethics of the Lutheran Church at that time. Believing that the Gospel is addressed to the individual and not to society or social orders, most Lutherans tended to shun so-called "social reform." In so far as much of the antislavery activity was aimed at the eradication of a social evil, Lutherans were therefore slower than others to become involved.

One final question might be asked. Why did the Lutherans finally fall into the pattern set by other leading Protestant denominations? Here it can only be said that Lutherans, in the North and in the South, like all other Americans during the period, were products of their culture. In spite of a common heritage from sixteenth century Europe, Lutherans in America in the middle of the nineteenth century were faced with a problem which had to be answered in terms of their own immediate historical situation. The result shows that in this case, at least, the patterns of a culture were stronger than those of an ecclesiastical tradition.

54 "The Lutheran Church and Secession" (editorial), *The Lutheran and Missionary,* September 4, 1862, p. 178.

55 *Minutes,* Lutheran Synod and Ministerium of South Carolina and Adjacent States, 1860, p. 11. See also Wade F. Hook, "The Lutheran Church in the Carolinas Sociologically Interpreted," in *The Lutheran Quarterly,* XI (1959), pp. 62, 63.

Journal of John Samuel Mau, 1794-1795

By Willard D. Allbeck

DURING the winter of 1794-95 a Lutheran pastor from the frontier in Kentucky made a trip eastward over the mountains, including his journey a visit to his aged mother in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. e kept a journal of parts of his travel which recently has come to ht. The document is interesting both as providing a view of those ys and as giving an insight into the person of the author.

John Samuel Mau was certainly his name, but those who heard s family name or saw it written printed it as Mow or Maw, or mis- ok the script to read Marr, Mann, or even Mace. Born March 3, 52, at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, he is said to have been a soldier in e War of Independence. As a married man he lived in Westmoreland unty, Pennsylvania, where a daughter was baptized in Zion Church 1785. The next year he moved to Kentucky. In 1789 he secured a ense to preach in that state from the president of the Ministerium Pennsylvania, who reported the fact to the next convention of his nod and received its approval. Mau was then described as having en a school teacher who by private study had "acquired a fair knowl- ge of theology." He was the only German Lutheran preacher in entucky at the time.

His license, ordinarily good only for one year, was renewed in 795, perhaps in connection with the trip recorded in the journal. By 804 he was in Ohio, living in the vicinity of Dayton. The public cords show that he purchased land in 1808 and the next year was eginning to report marriages. He taught school and preached to con- regations over a considerable area.

When the second Special Conference of Lutheran pastors west the mountains convened in 1813 in Fairfield County, Ohio, Mau as present to confess that for a time he had affiliated himself with ne United Brethren but desired to be reinstated as a Lutheran. This as approved. He attended Conferences in 1815 and 1816. But when ne Conference became the Ohio Synod in 1818 he was not present, nor

did he attend at any time afterward. Apparently he was never ordained Some coolness developed between him and other Lutherans. After 1820 there are no public records of marriages performed by him. His name does not appear in the minutes of the Ohio Synod after 1821 There is no record of his death, but his wife was appointed administratrix September 20, 1830. This is all that is known of his life. He is of interest because he was the organizer or early pastor of such congregations as Germantown and Lewisburg in Ohio and of others in Indiana.

His journal is in a fairly good state of preservation.[1] The script and orthography, as well as the meaning of some passages, present some difficulties which have not been completely solved.[2] Proper names were often spelled phonetically, creating no great problem for places (e.g., Gettysburg is "Geddistaun") but leaving some uncertainty about the names of persons.

The journal begins with Sunday, October 26, 1794, and continues through Friday of that week. In that time Mau traveled from Martinsburg, Virginia, to Hanover, Pennsylvania. The account resumes on Wednesday, November 12, and continues through November 21. This tells of his trip from near Reading to Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and visits at the latter place. Again there is a gap, the final section telling of the first five days in January, 1795, when he was back in Martinsburg. The last few pages are devoted to a family record. The whole account is quite personal and somewhat pietistic. His concern about the weather and expenses is understandable.

On October 26 I traveled from Martinsburg to Shepherdstown, which is te miles. It rained the entire day, and Mr. Stroeher[3] accompanied me. About eleve o'clock we came to Shepherdstown and lodged with Mr. Martin Entler near th Potomac River. He is a very God-fearing man. The whole expression of hi face shows him to be a deep thinker, cool and resolute in his undertakings, thought ful and quite considerate in speech. He was host to me in a very brotherly an excellent way. May God reward him for his faithfulness.

1 It is in the possession of Mrs. Frank Bobbitt, Waldron, Indiana.

2 Most of the deciphering and translation were done by two German exchange student Werner Christoph Echmauch and Wilhelm Polster. Research on the identity of names was don by Harold S. Gardner.

3 Such seems to be the spelling. His identity is uncertain. A man named Nicolaus Strebe was the Martinsburg delegate to the 1799 convention of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania.

About 2 p.m. I had public worship. There were forty-six persons present. reached on the words of Matthew 9:1-8. The theme: the sanctifying preaching the forgiveness of sins (1) as the most necessary of all, (2) as the most powerful all. Summary: where there is forgiveness of sins there is also life and blessedness.

October 27. Quite rainy. About nine o'clock it cleared up with a strong rthwest wind. I set out from Shepherdstown about eight o'clock across the tomac. Today my expenses were for ferry, oats, schill wine,[4] and a noon meal, 3d. First I traveled through Sharpsburg and then through Middletown, which ten miles from Frederick, and at four o'clock I came to Frederick and to Pastor ug, a very friendly man.[5] He received me in a very friendly and brotherly way. the evening we visited Mr. Runckel, the Reformed preacher.[6] He received very kindly. We talked at length, especially about the fear of hell and eternal nishment as a necessary part of conversion. I made the statement: "While I lieve that conversion coming only from the fear of hell, the devil, and damna- n can never be well established, and that such people, when they know for sure t there are no eternal punishments, damnation, devil, hell, and eternal torture, uld not care about God, yet if God wants to be God because of his love and thfulness and grace, they would not want to think of him at all, much less would y try to share in it." Mr. Runckel refuted the statement and emphasized the ntrary. Mr. Krug answered that God does not love slavish fear when fear is t in love, but there must be both child-like fear and love to God if the con- rsion is to be a serious one. We talked further, and then followed a friendly Good night" and "God bless you."

October 28. Nice weather. I stayed in Frederick today. At three o'clock in e afternoon I had service in the church on the text Luke 10:42, "one thing is edful." There: (1) the occasion for these important words; (2) to whom these rds are directed; (3) what this necessity is; (4) why this is so necessary. ne people of Frederick are self-satisfied and do not need anything else. Only few came to the house of the Lord—about forty souls. However, I had a very ce time with Mr. Krug. God bless him for the love he gave me.

October 29. There was nice weather. At nine o'clock I left there. Mr. Krug companied me five miles. On the way we had very edifying conversation upon e Word of God. Mr. Krug is indeed a great blessing to me. Thus one has to avel in ignorance, and on every occasion add to one's knowledge. Our departure as very cordial, and the honorable patriarch wished me many blessings. May

4 Schillerwein, made from black and white grapes.

5 John Andrew Krug, born in Saxony on March 19, 1732, died at Frederick, Maryland, arch 30, 1796. Ordained in Germany, he came to America in 1764 and became pastor in ederick in 1771. J. C. Jensson, *American Lutheran Biographies* (Milwaukee, 1890), pp. 434 f.

6 John William Runckel, born in the Palatinate April 28, 1749, died in Gettysburg, Penn- vania, 1832. He was ordained by ministers of the Coetus of Pennsylvania in 1778. He went to e four-church Frederick parish in 1784. Henry Harbaugh, *Fathers of the Reformed Church* Lancaster, 1857), II, 284 ff.

God fulfill all this and may he stay with me, a most insignificant one, and remai with all men.

At 11:30 I came to Middletown. Everyone here wants only money. If th people were as hungry for the Word of God as for red and white metal,[7] the something could be done here. One shilling [spent?]. I have half a shilling. Mid dletown is nine miles from Frederick. It is pretty well built. From here it i still eighteen miles to Hagerstown. In the evening, at eight o'clock, I came t Hagerstown and stayed with John Geiger. After the evening meal I visited th young Mr. Schmucker, preacher in this congregation.[8] It seems to me that thi man wanted to display his scholarship to me. I could not fail to notice and fee that in everything he is wiser, more intelligent, and oh! the wonderful Latin an Greek that flowed into his marvelous speech. I am . . . [sentence incomplete].

October 30. Very early Mr. Arnold visited me. He has a brother in Kentucky He asked about various circumstances, and after we talked awhile he agreed t move to Kentucky. He is an acceptable musician and teacher. He is a skille pianist.

At nine o'clock I left Hagerstown. It was a day of fine, beautiful weather Expenses today for two quarts of oats and [two words illegible]. Sixteen mile from Hagerstown. I fed [the horse] at the tavern of George Heck and there go some malt grain. I came to Gettysburg, which is thirty-three miles from Hagers town, at seven o'clock. About ten miles before Gettysburg I got in the compan of Mr. Schebeli, of Greencastle. We drank a fifth of wine and had our evenin meal. We talked awhile, especially about ghosts and how people seem to se ghosts and deceive themselves with many oracles. At eleven o'clock we wen to sleep.

October 31. Nice, clear weather. At eight o'clock we left Gettysburg. Each o us had to pay 5*s.* 7*d.* for the lodging, food, bread, and horse. Then we left Gettys burg. At ten o'clock we came to Mr. Hirsh's [tavern], the Shield of the Buttin Bull. We had some breakfast, and each of us paid 2*s.* Gettysburg is ten miles fron Mr. Hirsh. On the way we had random talk about old stories and similar things At the end of the morning we came to McAllister,[9] which is seven miles fron Mr. Hirsh. At 11:30 we came to McAllister. How happy I was when I saw my sister and her dear children after five years.[10] My brother-in-law was not a home, but fifteen minutes later he arrived. Now my joy was complete. In all thi joy I could merely pay an imperfect tribute: "To this Thou hast brought me

7 Mau wrote *Erde,* probably meaning copper and silver coins.

8 John George Schmucker, born in Darmstadt, Germany, August 18, 1771, died at William burg, Pennsylvania, October 7, 1854. He came to America with his parents in 1785, was or dained by the Ministerium of Pennsylvania in 1792, and was called to Hagerstown, Maryland in 1794. Later he was a leader in the General Synod. Jensson, *op. cit.,* pp. 682 f.

9 Founded in 1763 by Colonel Richard McAllister; renamed Hanover when incorporate in 1815.

10 It had been in 1789 that he had received from the president of the Ministerium of Penn sylvania a license to preach. Evidently on that trip from Kentucky he had visited his relatives

God. Once again Thou hast let me see my dear friends. In all this joy I do ot know what to say, but Thou knowest the thoughts of my heart. That is ough for me."

November 12. At ten o'clock I heard for the first time something about my ife's mother and her sister Magdalene. I was very glad to hear something of em. I hurried and asked everywhere about them, and finally learned exactly here they lived, and at twelve o'clock I reached them. Neither Mother nor her ster knew me until after I made myself known. The joy was great.

My brother-in-law's name is Frederick Dirs.[11] I stayed with them. They ve four daughters and three sons. The oldest son is called Henry. On August) he was nine years old. Then there is Hanna, eight years old on March 10; ary, six years old on January 27; Mary Elizabeth, four years old January 10; en John George, two years old October 15; then the twins, Anna Catherina d Mary Magdalene, born December 31, 1793.

November 13. Cold and rough today. At ten o'clock I left the home of my other-in-law, Frederick Dirs, for Reading, where Mr. Wildbahn is.[12] At eleven clock I reached Reading. I visited the preacher, Mr. Wildbahn, and ate with his mily at noon. We had much conversation, especially about Benedict Schwab's havior and his sermons and his way of life.[13] At one o'clock I left Reading on e way to Kerchersville[14] to visit Henry Hertzel.[15] He is a Reformed preacher, brave and honest man, a good soul with a faithful heart. I looked through his rary, which contained mostly sermon books written by good authors. His eatment of me was quite brotherly. He is about fifty-two years old, has a very od character, and does not talk too much.

November 14. At ten o'clock I left there. It was a very cold day, and at :45 it began to snow and was stormy all day long. I stayed in an inn, warmed

11 The spelling might be Dirrs or Dins, comparing the two places where the name appears. may be that Mau intended Derr.

12 Carl Frederick Wildbahn, immigrant from Saxony, ordained by the Ministerium of nnsylvania in 1762. His pastorate at Reading began in 1792. His death was reported to the 04 convention of the Ministerium. T. E. Schmauk, *History of the Lutheran Church in Penn-lvania* (Philadelphia, 1903), p. 390.

13 Schwab seems to have been something of a free-lance preacher. He appears briefly in the cords of the German Reformed, being either licensed or ordained by them in 1772 at the age forty. Harbaugh, *op. cit.*, II, 390 f. The name is sometimes spelled Schwob or Schwope. Cf. *inutes and Letters of the Coetus of the German Reformed Congregations in Pennsylvania* Philadelphia, 1903), *in loc.*

14 What Mau wrote looks like "Kerchers Staettel," but it might read Kuchersville, or per-ps even Kutztown was intended. Supposing it was this last, Mau took the Kutztown road. pping on the way to see Hertzel, who lived an afternoon's ride from Reading—about a dozen les; this would be near Moslem Springs. The attempt to identify the stopping places between eading and Allentown has failed.

15 Hertzel had been refused examination for ordination by the German Reformed Coetus in 77, yet without ordination was ministering to congregations in this area in 1792. *Op. cit.*, . 361, 453.

up with the Maurers, and paid there 1*s.* 6*d.*, and from there I traveled two miles. I handed over a letter [sentence unfinished]. He is a young man, careful and in his best years. From there I had seven miles to old white [haired] Michael Bobst. I arrived there at five o'clock in the evening almost frozen, wet and cold, and stayed with him overnight. We had several things to talk about, especially concerning his daughter and son-in-law in Kentucky. I was treated very cordially by him and his whole family, and the rest there was very refreshing to me.

November 15. It was still cool, but not so cold and stormy, and at ten o'clock I left there and still had twenty miles to go to Bethlehem. At about twelve o'clock the sky cleared of the dark flying clouds, but about four o'clock it was cloudy and gloomy again. At two o'clock I came to Allentown. I fed my horse and took a small refreshing drink. 1*s.* 4*d.* At three o'clock I left Allentown and at five o'clock I came safely to Bethlehem. I found all my relatives in good health. But my dear mother is already very feeble. The joy was great on both sides. We could not talk much this evening because the Unity of the Brethren had Communion this evening. David Bighof stayed at home, but Mother and Sister went there to Communion.[16] David and I meanwhile had some good talks concerning the Brethren, the institution, and the improvement of the congregation's Order. At ten o'clock we went to sleep and I slept quietly and well.

November 16. There was *Amts* Communion in Bethlehem.[17] Then there was an English sermon at eleven o'clock. Mr. Van Vleck[18] had the sermon on Matthew 18 concerning forgiveness and love for one's neighbor. He preached quite fundamentally and powerfully. Later I visited good old friends and everywhere I was cordially received. In the evening, at eight o'clock, Mr. Klingsohr[19] gave a very good speech on the words of Isaiah 55.

November 17. Again I visited a couple of good friends, and at ten o'clock I traveled to my brother-in-law, George Hertzel, six and a half miles from Bethlehem, and stayed there overnight. They treated me in a cordial and friendly way. Eight years ago, on May 6, his first wife died. She died of high fever. He married again on October 14 of the same year. The girl was Mary Dewald. With the first wife he begat three children: one son and two daughters, but one daughter

16 Mau seems to have written "Communicisten" and "Communication" to designate this Saturday evening service. Professor John R. Weinlick, of Moravian College and Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, writes: "The church diary for that particular Saturday in December reveals that there was a Lovefeast followed by Communion. The term 'communicisten' apparently refers to the fact that the service was for communicant members." Mau's phrase "Unity of the Brethren," means *Unitas Fratrum,* the Moravian Church.

17 The meaning is uncertain, but probably refers to the fact that Mau as a visiting minister was admitted to Communion by virtue of his office or *Amt.* (J.R.W.)

18 Jacob Van Vleck (1751-1831) was one of the pastors of Central Moravian Church, principal of the Seminary for Young Ladies, later a bishop and a leading clergyman of the Moravian Church. (J.R.W.)

19 John August Klingsohr (1746-1798) was also a pastor of Central Moravian Church and an outstanding clergyman. (J.R.W.)

s already gone to eternity. The eldest, the son of the first wife, is called George. e was born November 24, 1783. The second child, Elizabeth, was born Septem- r 11, 1785. The third child died. The children of the second wife: first a son, t he died immediately after birth, August 1. The second, born June 7, 1788, as called Anna Margareta. The third, born October 21, 1789, was called John. ne fourth child, born June 9, 1791, was named Mary Magdalene. The fifth, born ebruary 3, 1793, was called Catherine, but she was very sick.

November 18. A pretty day. At ten o'clock I traveled again to Bethlehem. visited several old acquaintances; Stotz, Jacob Weis. At Mr. Kliess's I was vited for lunch; only tedious discussion occurred—nothing of an enthusiastic irit could be observed, nor was there meditation after the meal. After the meal visited Mr. Weis, the dyer; nothing but silly talking occurred. I was invited for ffee and afterwards I visited his berry farm, but he was very secretive about e science of berry farming. Afterwards I visited Mr. Klingsohr, the preacher ere. He is in fact a righteous man, full of spirit and life, and given only to rving. We had a very long discussion and entertained ourselves in the infinite ve of Christ to all true repentance; second, about the miraculous guidance there for the man of God.

November 19. Lovely weather, bright and clear. I visited again several of y acquaintances. At eleven o'clock I went to the children's lesson. It consists . . . entence unfinished]. At two p.m. I said goodbye to all my friends, my dear other, brother-in-law, and sister. I had to keep myself under control so as not show my feelings. When I was alone again I had partly kindly and partly elancholy thoughts about . . . [sentence unfinished]. At 4:30 I came to Emmaus, here I visited Mr. Christian Heckewelder[20] and also . . . [unfinished]. Mr. ixon, a doctor in Emmaus[21] . . . [unfinished]. He treated me inexpressibly well.

November 20. It rained the whole day violently. I rode nineteen miles and ayed with the Rev. Mr. Lehman.[22] He is a lively man. He treated me in a lightful manner. There was nothing fanatical to be felt in him.

November 21. Bright, clear, but cold. I could hardly ride two or three miles ntil I was cold through and through. The Delaware[23] was very high because of uch rain. Since I was nineteen miles away from Mr. Lehman I put up with r. Christolf Wagner. I was very well entertained, and at ten o'clock on No- mber 22 I started again. Daniel Wagner accompanied me for sixteen miles.

20 Christian Renatus Heckewelder (1750-1803) was a storekeeper in Emmaus and later in e Moravian settlement of Hope, New Jersey, where he died. (C.R.W.)

21 Dr. Joseph Dixon began medical practice in Emmaus in July, 1793. His family was ominent in the Moravian Church. (C.R.W.)

22 Daniel Lehman (1754-1810) in 1795 was serving Lutheran congregations at Moselem, acungie, and Dryville. Later pastorates were in Lehigh County and at Reading. J. J. Kline, *History of the Lutheran Church in New Hanover* (New Hanover, 1910), pp. 122 f.

23 Evidently some stream other than the Delaware River since Mau apparently was aveling west.

January 1, 1795. I was in Martinsburg with Mr. John David Young.[24] He conducted worship based on the words of I Cor. 1:30. His speech was full of spirit and life. In the evening I was called by an Englishman to baptize a sick child, but instead of one I had to baptize three children. They were very poor people, and likewise poor in the knowledge of the Word of God.

Afterwards I visited an evening meeting conducted by a Methodist, an Englishman who had recently crept in. When this fellow finished his speech I came forward and asked permission to say some words also. I asked them concerning the purpose of the meeting. May the Lord's blessing upon these people this year be as it was with Nehemiah. If this is to be the case, new things will come of it and they will be blessed; if not, there will follow delusion, hypocrisy, hardness of heart, and some turning away. And oh, how smooth the way will be. Don't misunderstand me, dear friends in Jesus Christ, to be making an intrusion into your evening hours. Search and prove your purpose: is it honest and correct? Does it come from a holy desire to become children of God, etc.? There was complete silence and great attention.

This morning I looked for a passage for the consolation and encouragement of my heart in the *Golden Treasury*:[25] *"And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.* Matt. xxviii.20. *I will be with him in trouble,* etc. Ps. xci.15. *Be not dismayed at their faces, lest I confound thee before them.* Jer. i.17. O my soul, spread out all thy complaint before the Lord as though he were visibly near thee; for he is truly with thee, even in thy times of greatest need, wise in counsel and mighty to save. Faith indeed does not actually see, but it lays such hold of God as though it did see Him who is invisible. Thus by its trials and the help it obtains it waxes stronger and stronger. Of what, then, shall I be afraid? . . .

In all life's woes Thy word my trust shall be,
And when I die, the same shall comfort me."

For my dear and beloved wife I turned to: "Whither thou goest I will go and where thou lodgest I will lodge. Thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God. Where thou diest will I die, and there will I be buried. The Lord do so to me, and more also, if aught but death part thee and me" (Ruth 1:16, 17). My God, I am thine, and my Catherine is thine also.

January 2. Lovely weather. O Lord, give me obedience, love, and fidelity so that my prayer may be heard. This day I walked in town with Mr. Young to the Englishman in order to get a contribution for the Martinsburg church. We had rather good success. All the rest of the time was spent with useful books.

January 3. Cloudy weather. This afternoon at two o'clock I rode from

24 He came to America in 1789, was licensed in 1790 and ordained in 1791 by the Ministerium of Pennsylvania. He became pastor in Martinsburg in 1790 and died in February 1804. A. R. Wentz, *History of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Maryland* (Harrisburg, 1920), p. 480.

25 *Güldenes Schatzkästlein,* by Carl Henry von Bogatzky; meditations composed while a student in Halle University, about 1718. The passage Mau cited is for November 24, and is here given in the translation edited by C. W. Schaeffer (Philadelphia, 1858), pp. 428 f.

Martinsburg to Jacob Stroh and Mr. Young toward Winchester, but I returned because he had fallen ill.[26]

January 4. I held services in Shepherdstown. I preached about II Peter 3:2-10. There was a numerous assembly. Topics: (1) Encouragement, verses 1-4; (2) Admonition, verses 5-8; (3) Request, the reason, verses 10-11. I lodged with Mayor Bildinger.

January 5. I traveled to Bay Creek, to the water spring, but I lost my way and did not arrive at the right place until ten o'clock at night.

[Family Record]

I, John Samuel May, was born in the state of Pennsylvania at Bethlehem the year of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ on March 3, 1752. My late father was called John Samuel Mau, and my late mother was called Eva Catherine, and both lived until the end of their lives among the Moravian Unity of Brethren. [Four pages missing.] . . . at Sewickley,[27] thirty-five miles from Fort Pittsburg the back country of the state of Pennsylvania. On April 11 in the year of our Lord Jesus Christ 1786, I, my beloved wife, and two children, Adam and Hanna Fredericka, went from the state of Pennsylvania to the state of Kentucky and arrived there at Limestone[28] happily and well on April 22 at two o'clock at night.

On May 3 in the year of Christ 1787 another daughter arrived. After a life of three hours the Lord took her again and placed her in a better life.

On September 23 in the year of our Saviour Jesus Christ 1789, the dear God gave us again a son. We lived at that time in the congregation near Danville, Mercer County, Kentucky.[29] In holy baptism he received the name John Samuel. Dear God, be merciful, bless and guide him with thy grace, and dignify him later to become thy servant. Let Adam, the firstborn of the sons, and this little Samuel both become true and faithful servants of thy congregation. Amen.

On March 5 in the year of Christ, our Lord and Saviour, 1791, God made us happy by giving us another daughter. In holy baptism she received the name Rebecca Charlotte. God of peace, take care of her and let neither height nor depth separate her from thee. Fill her heart with true fear of God, and send her Jesus, thy Son. Let her beauty be purity, gentleness, modesty, and pure love for thee, the triune God, and for everything which is pleasing to thee.

On April 14 in the year of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ 1793 the dear God gave us another daughter. In holy baptism she received the name Rachel Henrietta. Press her, Jesus, to thy dear breast; kiss her with the kiss of peace.

26 The meaning here is obscure. An afternoon's ride would have taken Mau only a few miles out of Martinsburg, whereas Winchester was a full day's journey away.

27 A small settlement near West Newton on Sewickley Creek in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania.

28 Maysville, Ky.

29 Mercer County was later subdivided, putting Danville in Boyle County.

I lay her and all my children on thy fatherly heart. They all are thine alone, and let them eternally remain so.

On January 23 in the year of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ 1797, at 6:02 in the morning, the gracious God gave us another son. Great God, Creator of all mankind, this child is thine also. Not mine; thine alone. Thou alone art the Father. Take him in thy divine arms. Jesus, friend of children, bless him with wisdom, piety, love, purity, patience. Give him keen intellect, judgment, judiciousness, good memory, ability, learning. Give this also to me that I may educate him to thine honor, service, praise, and glory. My dearest triune God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Amen. On April 18 of the same year he was received into the Christian church and into God's covenant of grace through the bath of holy baptism, and received the name Christian David. Sponsors were Christian Kenery and his wife Barbara.

On February 14 in the year of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ 1799, at twelve o'clock noon, the Lord gave us another daughter [Eva Pamela]. O God and Lord, let also this child grow in true knowledge and genuine piety and fervent love for thee, the only God and Lord. Thou, O God, art the true Father of the child. Thy wisdom has planned her and built her with healthy and beautiful members. Therefore, O God, I give this child forever into thy dear arms. This child which thou hast given to us is thine. Thine alone she shall be. I give her to thee forever as thine alone. Amen, amen, amen.

This year, 1817, my children are aged as follows: John Adam, born November 29, 1782; age 35. Hanna Fredericka, born February 18, 1785; age 32. John Samuel, born September 23, 1789; age 28. Rebecca Charlotte, born March 5, 1791; age 26. Henrietta, born April 14, 1793; age 24. Christian David, born January 3, 1797; age 20. Eva Pamela, born February 14, 1799; age 18.

On April 11 in the year of Christ 1786 we moved from the state of Pennsylvania, from the area of Sewickley, to the state of Kentucky.[30] We went by water on a river boat on the Monongahela [River], and from there on the great waterway of the Ohio. On April 22 of that year we landed fortunately at Limestone. We lived in this state of Kentucky under the protection and blessings of God until the year 1804. Many . . . [Sentence unfinished. There follows a calendar list of forty-two unlucky days with a description of them; not translated.]

30 This repeats what was said above.

Movement Toward the Mind of Christ

By Martin E. Lehman

MANKIND is willy-nilly involved in the time-process here on earth. Indeed, man's consciousness of being a part of this process and his reflections as to the meaning and purpose of these involvements have given rise to human history. History as such concerns itself with significant human actions and accomplishments within the bounds of time and space. In order to avoid confusion, we must make a distinction between historical and natural science. History has to do with that which man does spontaneously in the time-process, while biological evolution as a process within time belongs to the realm of natural science.

Man is preeminently an historical being by virtue of the historical sense that characterizes his life, his activities, and his plans. And yet man as an historical being does not stand isolated and unrelated to both nature and God. "It is as impossible to detach man from history and to consider him abstractly as it is to detract history from man and to examine it from without, that is, from a non-human point of view. Nor is it possible to consider man isolated from the profoundest spiritual reality of history."[1]

Because God has dealings with man in history, Nathan Söderblom's epigrammatic statement has undeniable validity: "History is the true workshop of God."[2] In fact, the Christian faith affirms unequivocally that God is both at work in and in control of human history.

There can be no doubt about the fact that the Hebrew-Christian tradition is in the main responsible for a profound development of the historical sense precisely because faith in the sovereign power of God over and in human affairs is at the center of this tradition. And since "history is the field of his activity and revelation,"[3] the study of history in the light of God's self-disclosure to man is a most pertinent and urgent responsibility of the Christian church on earth.

Inasmuch as the church itself has a long and notable history, it is above all essential that its members take cognizance of God's special activity in church history and seek to interpret his dealings in and through his Word and Spirit within the historical manifestations of church life. Since God's final Word to mankind is his grace and truth revealed in their fullness and finality by Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord, who "was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man," all church history should be viewed in the light of the

1 Nicolas Berdyaev, *The Meaning of History* (London, 1949), p. 15.
2 Nathan Söderblom, *The Nature of Revelation* (Oxford, 1933), p. 57.
3 Heinz-Dietrich Wendland, *Geschichtsanschauung und Geschichtsbewusstsein im Neuen Testament* (Göttingen, 1938), p. 22.

centrality of the incarnate Word, of his Lordship and of his redemptive and transforming power, as he manifested himself in this capacity in the concrete reality of the lives of Christian peoples. We can thus observe God's activity and purpose supremely within the history of the church because this is the sphere of his redeeming work. In this sense, then, we are dealing with "holy history," which is both the continuation and the fulfillment of God's covenant relationship to the people of Israel in the Old Testament and of his covenant relationship to his "own people" (I Peter 2:9) in the New Testament who have been chosen from the various peoples and nations of the world.

Holy history, the history of God's gracious dealing with individuals, groups, and peoples, is in reality the soul of world history which invests with special meaning and dynamism the entire drama of the historical process here on earth. Holy history, in order to be true to its particular character and mission, must always move toward and manifest the mind of Christ. Such movement toward the mind of the Lord of the church becomes a reality in human lives, and thereby in history, through a personal trust in and obedience to Jesus Christ as the one who effectively reconciles us to God by his sin-atoning death on the cross and by his resurrection from the dead.

Movement toward and manifestation of the mind of Christ are synonymous with living in a Father-child relationship to God himself through faith in the incarnate Word. It is this movement, initiated and made effective by the Spirit of God in human hearts, that constitutes holy history, in which God deals redemptively with mankind through the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

The problem arises: What are the dynamics of holy history? What are the marks of God's redeeming activity within the history of salvation? That they center in the proclamation of the Word and the administration of the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper is a central truth in our Protestant heritage. For this reason the Augsburg Confession makes the lucid statement: "It is also taught among us that one holy Christian church will be and remain forever. This is the assembly of all believers among whom the Gospel is preached in its purity and the holy sacraments are administered according to the Gospel."[4] This general affirmation which indicates to us the locus of holy history requires elucidation. We shall therefore call attention to specific features that are in evidence in the concrete manifestations of holy history within the time process in order that we might be able better to discern the course of such history. In this way we shall be in the position to gauge and evaluate the church's history of the past centuries in all of its rich variety and tortuous concatenations within the context of world history in general.

One of the dynamics of holy history is *direction.* This quality is embedded in the biblical message. It is found particularly among the utterances of the Old

4 *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (Philadelphia, 1959), p. 32.

Testament prophets who, seeing that the people of Israel had forsaken their covenant with the Lord and were heading for ruin, sought to recall them to their God-intended direction and destiny in life. The message, couched in various phrases in different concrete historical situations, was always a call to repentance, to return to God, to trust in him, and to follow his directions.

And in the New Testament John the Baptist was preeminently the preacher of repentance, of the demand for a change in the life of man, of a radical reorientation of one's entire life. This call to repentance implied forsaking the old, sinful ways of the past and going God's way of righteousness and truth. It promised the miracle of divine forgiveness and of being given the opportunity of going in the right direction in life by God's mercy and truth, as these were brought to God's chosen people and to all mankind supremely by Christ himself.

Significantly, Jesus also began his ministry with the call to repentance. "Now after John was arrested, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying, 'The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent, and believe in the gospel' " (Mark 1:14, 15). Of course there was an important difference in Christ's preaching because in his person the Kingdom of God was actually present on earth. John the Baptist pointed to the Saviour, while Jesus was himself the embodiment of the message he proclaimed. Nevertheless, the call to repentance, to the decision of faith, always remained an integral part of the Gospel message. Whenever and wherever the good news of the new life in the Kingdom of God, centering in Christ, was proclaimed, it demanded repentance and the decision of faith, thereby giving a wholly new direction to life itself.

Peter's pentecostal sermon set the tone for subsequent apostolic preaching and contained the same basic emphasis. The apostle therefore told the multitude, listening to his sermon on the day of Pentecost, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:38). Thus going in the right direction in life was predicated on heeding the call to repentance.

This particular aspect of the proclamation of the Gospel may consequently be regarded as one of the permanent dynamics of holy history. In fact, it pervades the preaching of the New Testament. It became the basis of the conversion of the apostle Paul and is found scattered throughout his Epistles. "Therefore, if any one is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has passed away, the new has come" (II Cor. 5:17). In the Book of Revelation five of the seven congregations, to which special messages were sent by the Lord Jesus himself through John, were told to repent in order that they might do that which was pleasing in the sight of God.

Subsequently, too, periods of renewal in the history of the church were times of repentance. Repentance marked the beginning of a new direction in the life of the youthful, carefree, wealthy Francis of Assisi. He exemplifies for us the high-water mark of medieval Christian piety which was based on voluntary renunciation of worldly goods and a life of faith in and obedience to Jesus Christ.

This call to repentance characterized the beginning of the Reformation, which resulted in the restoration of the Gospel of Jesus Christ to its primacy and pristine power and glory in the church. The first of the Ninety-Five Theses, posted on the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg, issued the clarion call to repentance. "When our Lord and Master Jesus Christ said, 'Repent' (Matt. 4:17), he willed the entire life of believers to be one of repentance."[5] So the call to repentance set the stage for a genuine revaluation of religious values and for the possibility of moving in the right direction again in the church. It was based on the recovery of the church's essential message, as is clear from these words of the sixty-second thesis: "The true treasure of the church is the most holy gospel of the glory and grace of God."[6]

Arnold Toynbee, in his monumental study of human history, gives his keen historical observations a prophetic twist when he indicates that an attitude of repentance would be a necessary factor in the possibility of being granted a new lease on life in our Western society in which all the symptoms of a breakdown and disintegration are discernible. In other words, he definitely implies that, if Western society is going to move again in the right direction, it must repent. He says, "We may and must pray that a reprieve which God has granted to our society once will not be refused if we ask for it again in a contrite spirit and with a broken heart."[7]

It is most assuredly this note of repentance in its deepest Christian significance that ought to characterize above all the life of the church in the face of its many weaknesses, its secular attitudes, its dividedness, and its failure to be what the Lord Jesus expects it to be. Repentance is necessary before "the church might be presented before him in splendor, without spot, or wrinkle or any such thing, that she might be holy and without blemish" (Eph. 5:27).

A second factor in the dynamics of holy history is *depth*. This depth is rooted in God himself and cannot be found anywhere else or achieved in any other way. Upon it believers can and must depend amid all the varying circumstances and conditions of human life. It is the righteousness of God in Christ Jesus, our Lord.

A lack of this depth means that human life cannot attain its true fulfillment. Life without this divine depth is characterized by hollowness and superficiality which might easily give the appearance of well-being and progress when in reality such living is honeycombed with potential weakness and headed for ultimate ruin. This absence of depth, of having human life based on the firm footing of divine righteousness, has often been and still is the supreme peril of the church. It has become the source of a false trust and of many other woes, weaknesses, and aberrations within the church.

The unnamed prophet of Chapter 64 in the Book of Isaiah confronted his generation with its woeful lack of depth. "We have all become like one who is

5 *Luther's Works,* Vol. 31 (Philadelphia, 1957), p. 25.
6 *Ibid.,* p. 31.
7 Arnold Toynbee, *A Study of History,* Vol. VI (Oxford, 1940), p. 321.

unclean," he told his people, "and all our righteous deeds are like a polluted garment. We all fade like a leaf, and our iniquities, like the wind, take us away" (Isa. 64:6). Jesus was similarly concerned about the absence of this depth in human lives in the Sermon on the Mount. "For I tell you," he said to his disciples, "unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 5:20).

The apostolic church was conscious of having its life anchored in the all-sufficient depth of God's righteousness in Christ. This was the basis of its power and joy. The church of the apostles proclaimed a sure salvation based on the righteousness of God which Jesus by his life, his death on the cross, and his resurrection from the grave made available to everyone who had faith. For the righteousness of God, revealed through faith for faith, was the divinely planned and executed foundation that alone had the necessary depth and strength to support the church in its work and mission of salvation in the world.

Whenever and wherever the church of Jesus Christ has forgotten about or forsaken this sure way of salvation, it has hewn out for itself broken cisterns that can hold no water instead of drawing from God's well the water of life made available by his only Son, our Saviour. That is why Luther, in defending the material principle of the Reformation, the justification of the believer through faith in Christ alone, said solemnly in the Smalcald Articles: "The first and chief article is this, that Jesus Christ, our God and Lord, 'was put to death for our trespasses and raised again for our justification' (Rom. 4:25). He alone is 'the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world' (John 1:29). 'God has laid upon him the iniquities of us all' (Isa. 53:6). Moreover, 'all have sinned,' and 'they are justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, by his blood' (Rom. 3:23-25). . . . Nothing in this article can be given up or compromised, even if heaven and earth and things temporal should be destroyed. For as St. Peter says, 'There is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved' (Acts 4:12). 'And with his stripes we are healed' (Isa. 53:5)."[8]

Christ's righteousness is therefore the center and never-failing source of the believer's confidence and hope in the church. This eternally valid righteousness provides the Christian with an adequate defense in depth against any accusations or misgivings of his aroused conscience. "There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus" (Rom. 8:1). They live in Christ and for Christ by faith. Thus their lives become a movement toward his mind in that they are fully justified by faith in him and are claimed by him in order that they might serve and glorify God in all that they say and do.

The church must always continue to draw from the unfathomable depths of God's righteousness and love by which for the sake of Christ and his cross he freely justifies those who turn to the Saviour in faith in order that they might

8 *Book of Concord*, p. 292.

live as his children who have been forgiven and set free to do his will. This is the central message of the Gospel which the apostle Paul defended against all distortion and harmful amalgamation with any kind of human efforts or works. This marvelous depth of God's grace dare therefore never be lost sight of by the church and in the church in its divinely ordained movement toward the mind of Christ.

A third guiding principle in God's redemptive history on earth is *dedication*. The call for committed Christians meets us everywhere in the New Testament, and the epochs in church history that interest and inspire us and upon which we focus our attention particularly are those in which Christian leaders and Christian people in general gave convincing evidence of a whole-hearted devotion to Jesus Christ and his cause. Consequently the study of the early church with all of its martyrs and confessors not only fascinates us but also frequently shames us into admitting our own half-heartedness and a lack of complete commitment.

Commitment to Christ and his Kingdom is a mark of those times in the history of the church which witnessed a mighty movement toward the mind of the Lord of the church. In fact, all truly Christian educational, evangelistic, missionary, and eleemosynary activities of the church are predicated upon sincere devotion to Jesus Christ. Without full commitment to the Christian faith the church can never be and become what it should be in the lives of people, a movement toward the mind of Christ through humble, loving service in his kingdom out of heart-felt gratitude.

The Christ who by his great self-sacrifice on the cross justifies his people also summons them to deny themselves, take up the cross, and follow him. Counting the cost of discipleship and paying the price gladly and uncomplainingly are the twin demands that have been met by true believers in the church's past. And it is this quality which makes them so humanly warm, inspiring, and attractive for us. To such followers of Christ the church owes much because they are the ones who have exhibited joy and contentment in moving toward Jesus' mind. In our own century Dietrich Bonhoeffer has become a shining example of this kind of dedication. He rightly reminded us of God's "costly grace" and, in bringing it to our attention, lived and died in a faithful appreciation of its meaning.

A fourth factor in the history of God's salvation is *durability*. Christians belong to "a kingdom that cannot be shaken" (Heb. 12:28b). Christ promised that the gates of hell would not be able to prevail against his church. And so it has been a constant source of courage and consolation to believers that in the midst of all upheavals and catastrophes the church would continue its work and could never be annihilated.

O where are kings and empires now
Of old that went and came?
But, Lord, thy church is praying yet,
A thousand years the same.

Modern man seems to be so enamoured of what is fleeting and ephemeral. He therefore seeks satisfaction in the realization of his temporal dreams and in the pursuit of passing pleasures. Consequently that which is permanent and cannot be shaken even by the crack of doom eludes him. And because the abiding values of life are disregarded by him, he finds life devoid of content and meaning. By contrast, the durability of God's Kingdom and of that which is done in and for that Kingdom gives abiding meaning to church history, inspiring believers of every generation with faith and hope.

Not only will the church of God continue from age to age until the end of time; nothing that is conceived and carried out in the spirit of Christ within the church will ever be forgotten. Jesus' parable of the last judgment underlines this truth. "Truly, I say to you, as you did it to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it to me" (Matt. 25:40). These words point up the durability of all Christian deeds here on earth. They ought to act as an incentive for the church not to grow weary in well-doing but to engage incessantly in the hard struggle of moving toward the mind of Christ, toward the servant image which he exemplified in such a matchless way.

God is actually at work in his church, enabling its members "to will and to work for his good pleasure" (Phil. 2:13b). Gratefully we can trace the hand of God in the past history of the church. For he has effected his purpose through his people, even though but feebly and incompletely. Prayerfully we can look to him now that he might through the availing truth and grace of his Son empower the church of the present and the future to do not only what pleases him but also what is meaningful and durable, as it continues to minister to the welfare and salvation of countless human lives in the name and spirit of the Master.

Our final lodestar in holy history is *design.* God has a plan and a purpose for this world, and so it has been rightly said that "history is movement toward a goal."[9] In the history of salvation the goal and purpose of the Kingdom of God are fulfilled at the end of the world. Eschatology is so deeply lodged in the very heart of the good news of salvation that only by sheer arbitrariness could one remove it and relegate it to an unimportant place in Christ's teachings about the Kingdom of God.

To be sure the Kingdom of God is a present reality on earth in the hearts of believers here and now. Yet it is also quite clearly a power that has yet to come to its full realization. So, in the words of the New Testament, "according to his promise we wait for new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells" (II Peter 3:13). While the Gospel of Jesus is the power of God for salvation in the lives of those who have faith here on earth and while this power manifests itself in their lives in the present age, Christians really make only a beginning here and now. In this life they are at one and the same time just and sinners. In the words of Luther, "They are just because they believe in Christ,

9 Wendland, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

whose righteousness covers them and is imputed to them. They are sinners, however, because they do not fulfill the law and are not without concupiscence. But like sick people in the care of a doctor, they are really ill and only begin to be healed or made whole in hope, i.e., are becoming well. The presumption that they are already well would be most harmful to them, for it would cause a relapse."[10]

The longing for wholeness, for complete restoration, is present in the lives of God's people; and it is God's design that this longing should be fulfilled. Yet the fulfillment does not occur within the framework of world history. The iron circle of historical immanence has indeed been decisively broken by the self-disclosure of God in history in the person of Jesus Christ. Eternal life therefore begins here and now through trust in Christ. At the same time "it does not yet appear what we shall be." Hence there is the final goal toward which God is directing the history of mankind, and particularly redemptive history. While the realization of this purpose begins in history in the lives of those who believe in the Gospel, its fulfillment is reserved for that unknown period when the end comes and when Christ will deliver the Kingdom to God the Father. It will be the time when "the kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever" (Rev. 11:156). Then movement toward the mind of Christ will have reached its goal; then the militant church on earth will become the triumphant church in heaven; then faith will give way to sight; and then Christ's people will know even as also they have been known. This history of redemption which unfolds itself in the church on earth is thus undergirded by the steadfast purpose of God, who grants strength, courage, and hope to all Christian pilgrims on the way and who will one day make his triumph complete.

Movement toward the mind of Christ ought always to be a glorious reality within the historical church on earth. Yet in order that we might know how and when this takes place, we have called attention to certain dynamic truths in holy history that are predicated on the proclamation of the Gospel message in the fullness of its power and relevance in the lives of people. For only when such dynamic factors, which are inherent in all that the revelation of God in Christ stands for, operate within the church, can movement toward the mind of Christ, and so toward the saving purpose of God, take place. Church history teaches us, who by faith are a part of God's plan of redemptive history, to be deeply concerned about the one, true, and everlasting treasure of the church in the world, God's eternal Word, the holy Gospel: for "it is the power of God for salvation to every one who has faith" (Rom. 1:16). Such concern, under the illumination and guidance of the Holy Spirit, will never be in vain.

10 *Luthers Werke, WA* 56: 347.

Correspondence and Comment

Did Luther Advocate Feeding Faith on Christ's Testament?

In his article in the Quarterly for November, 1960, "Sacraments of the Word in Luther," William H. Lazareth states, "There is nothing in Luther to support the argument sometimes heard today that the Sunday service is merely a graceless 'torso' if it does not reach its 'climax' in the 'celebration of the Eucharist.'" On the contrary, I believe there is everything in Luther to support such a notion and, on the other hand, nothing to support Mr. Lazareth's position. However, the purpose of this letter is not to demonstrate my contention in regard to the entire content of Luther's works, but rather to take issue with the interpretation that Mr. Lazareth gives to the passage from one of Luther's writings that he cites as support for his position.

I am referring, of course, to the citation where Luther says, "I can daily enjoy the sacrament in the Mass if I only keep before my eyes the testament, that is, the words and covenant of Christ, and feed and strengthen my faith thereby." If we interpret this passage the way Mr. Lazareth does, it would mean that public worship could be dispensed with altogether without any loss of grace just so long as we make the spiritual communion of which Luther speaks. Although I am willing to agree that for good cause this is quite possible, I am not willing to admit that Luther advocated the abandonment of public worship, or any part of it. It is clear from a larger sampling of his work and from his own practice that he intended that the principal parochial service on the Lord's Day and on the major feast days should be inclusive and public, that it should consist of the eucharist as well as the synaxsis and sermon.

It is not proper and correct to use this remark of Luther's which Mr. Lazareth cites to support the notion that the eucharist may often be dispensed with. Luther therein was not advocating the dispensability of the sacrament but the primacy of the word. He was no more doing so than was Aquinas when the latter admits that the sign may be dispensed with. There is nothing evangelical about such a notion. Scholasticism is not opposed to it; and it is one of the goals of mysticism. No, indeed, Luther was no more advocating what Mr. Lazareth claims than he was advocating spiritual communion instead of public.

I would respectfully suggest that Mr. Lazareth spend some time reading Luther's treatise on the heavenly prophets. There he would see that Luther did not intend the passage he cites in the way he (Mr. Lazareth) interprets it.

Edward Emmers

A Reply on the Relation of Word and Sacrament in Luther

I am grateful for the opportunity to reply to Edward Emmers' reactions to my recent article on "Sacraments of

the Word in Luther." While appreciative of his irenic spirit, I do not believe that any of the correspondent's undocumented generalities can be substantiated by serious source analysis of Luther's works. For the sake of clarifying the chief issues, I shall direct some of the pertinent evidence to five specific questions.

1. Is there "everything in Luther" to support the view that "the Sunday service is merely a graceless 'torso' if it does not reach its 'climax' in the 'celebration of the Eucharist?' " No.

Such an assertion is unthinkable for Luther since it would mean that the declaration of absolution and the oral proclamation of the Word are not also means of God's saving grace. But Luther's teachings on this score are clear and unequivocal. "The principal purpose of any service of worship is the teaching and preaching of the Word of God."[1] Indeed, "A Christian congregation never should assemble unless God's Word is preached and prayer is made, no matter for how brief a time this may be."[2] This is because, "There is no greater treasure on earth than the Word of God. The sacrament itself is made, blessed, and sanctified by the Word of God."[3] Luther describes the office of preaching as the "highest office in the Christian church," in comparison with which the administration of the sacraments is a "minor office" which could even "be left to others, as did Christ and St. Paul and all the apostles."[4] The fact is that "the church is a daughter, born of the Word, not the mother of the Word."[5] Consequently the purpose even of altars is "not for sacrifice but for the preaching of the Word."[6]

We may therefore conclude with Pelikan, "The Word of God in the church usually took the form of the oral Word, the Word of preaching. Throughout his career Luther emphasized the centrality of this oral Word in the life and work of the church. . . . When one meets the phrase 'Word of God' in Luther's writings, it usually has reference to this oral Word of proclamation."[7] What, then, is the source of the headless "torso" liturgical orientation? "It was not until the nineteenth century that the Roman Catholic Bishop W. E. Ketteler called the use of the liturgy up to the Preface 'a castrated Mass' and a few Lutherans followed suit and referred to it as 'a torso.' From the point of view of the Roman Mass, this is of course true, but there is no evidence that Lutherans of the sixteenth century used the Roman Mass as a criterion."[8]

2. Is it "clear from a larger sampling of his work and from his own practice" that Luther strongly championed a weekly celebration of Holy Communion? No.

In his *Ordering of Divine Worship*

1 *Luthers Werke*, Weimarer Ausgabe *(WA)*, XVIII, 78.

2 *Works of Martin Luther (WML)*, (Philadelphia, 1915-1932), VI, 60.

3 *WA*, X, 3; 70.

4 *WML*, IV, 84.

5 *WA*, XLII, 334.

6 *WA*, XLIII, 483.

7 Jaroslav Pelikan, *Luther the Expositor: Introduction to the Reformer's Exegetical Writings* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1959), pp. 63, 64.

8 T. G. Tappert, in Helmut Lehmann, ed., *The Meaning and Practice of the Lord's Supper* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1961), p. 99.

523), Luther was mandatory about eaching and permissive about the crament. On the one hand, "these rvices are to be so ordered that the ngregation will hear preaching on th occasions, in the morning on the stomary Gospel, in the evening on e Epistle."[9] On the other hand, "If ayone desires to receive the sacrament this time, it shall be administered to im; this can be arranged for properly the usual order according to the rcumstance of time and person. The ily Masses are certainly to be olished, for the importance is in the Jord and not in the Masses. . . . Mass to be held, *as devotion and time per-it;* for in this connection one cannot y down either a law or a limit."[10]

Hans Preuss summarizes Luther's on-legalistic views on the desired equency of Holy Communion. "A tizen of Wittenberg who declared at he had not gone to the Lord's upper in fifteen years was threatened y Luther with excommunication 'that e might be considered a dog.'[11] In the *Hauspostille* we read that it is not nough to go to Absolution and Com-nunion once or twice a year.[12] In the arge Catechism Luther laments the act that there is a large multitude who o without the sacrament for one, two, r three years and longer.[13] In the mall Catechism Luther declares that ne must go 'about four times,' if one oes not wish to appear to be a despiser f the sacrament.[14] He himself went o the Lord's Supper usually every ourteen days or at the most three veeks,' according to Veit Dietrich[15] in is reminiscences of Luther."[16] Once vhen too many people turned up at a Lenten service in 1531, Luther even admonished the people in Wittenberg to postpone reception of the sacrament because "there is plenty of time" in succeeding weeks.[17] Again, the sources simply do not corroborate the correspondent's extravagant claims.

3. Does my interpretation of the cited passage in any way suggest "that public worship could be dispensed with altogether without any loss of grace?" No.

The purpose of my essay was to defend the view that "instead of pitting one form of the Word against another, we should joyfully offer to the world both a sacramental Word and a verbal sacrament, since Christ is truly present and actually gives what he promises in the sermon and in the sacrament" (p. 315). An impartial reading will reveal that there is not one sentence in the essay to indicate any other concern than the proper coordination of the oral and sacramental forms of the gracious Word of God. That this is the authentic position of Luther has also been substantiated by numerous liturgical studies in the Luther-renaissance.[18]

9 *WML,* VI, 62.
10 *WML,* VI, 63. Italics our own.
11 *WA, TR* 4473.
12 *WA,* LII, 663.
13 *WA,* XXX, 1; 229.
14 *WA,* XXXIV, 2; 360.
15 *WA,* XLVIII, 326.
16 Hans Preuss, "Luther as Communicant," in *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* XIV (1941), pp. 191 ff.
17 *WA,* XXXIV, 1; 189.
18 *E.g.,* Vilmos Vajta, *Luther on Worship* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1958), pp. 16 ff.; Regin Prenter, "Luther on Word and Sacrament," in Gerhard Belgum, ed., *More*

The immediate context of the disputed passage is that of asserting the "evangelical priority" of "testament" over "sacrament" in Luther's pre-1520 theological development (p. 326). This cannot be disputed. To be sure, Luther is protesting here against the primary abuse of the Roman Mass: "We have lost the chief blessing, to wit, the testament and the faith."[19] A polemical tone is also evident in his insistence, "For all the Masses stacked together are worthless without the Word of God. However, today this order has been reversed miserably."[20]

Normally, the Christian will receive the benefits of the gospel of Christ regularly in both Word and sacrament. However, should he be denied evangelical access to the altar, Luther holds that a Christian could still enjoy the benefits of the sacrament simply by faith in the "testament," the word of promise.[21] Or again, "A man can be righteous by faith without bodily reception of the sacraments, so long as he does not despise them, but without faith no sacrament is of any use."[22] After all, "It is not the sacrament but the faith of the sacrament that justifies."[23] No one is citing these passages in order to advocate the elimination of public worship. They are simply offered as reminders—*in extremis*—of the centrality of faith in the Word in Luther's theology of worship.

4. Does the later work *"Against Heavenly Prophets"* (1525) indicate that Luther "did not intend the passage" the way it has been interpreted in the essay's survey of his pre-1520 development? No.

For his struggles against the *Schwaermer* as well as against the Roman Catholics, Luther remained constant in his assertion that it is the Word of God that makes the sacrament valid. This is the evangelical answer to both sacramentalism and mysticism. "Even if only bread and wine were there present, as they [Carlstadt's party] claim, as long as the word, 'Take, eat, this is my body given for you,' etc., is there, the forgiveness of sins, on account of this word, would be in the sacrament. . . . Everything depends on the Word."[24] Nevertheless it is important to note that Luther does not pit sermon against sacrament, but unites them both against the fanatics' notions of unmediated grace. "Now when God sends forth his holy gospel he deals with us in a twofold manner, first outwardly, then inwardly. Outwardly he deals with us through the oral word of the gospel and through material signs, that is, baptism and the sacrament of the altar. Inwardly he deals with us through the Holy Spirit, faith, and other gifts. But whatever their measure or order the outward factors should and must precede. . . . This factious spirit has as his purpose to reverse this order."[25]

Regardless of the direction of the challenge, Christian liberty is not to

About Luther (Decorah: Luther College, 1958), pp. 65 ff.; Jaroslav Pelikan, *Luther the Expositor*, pp. 220 ff.

19 *WML*, I, 307.

20 *WA*, XVIII, 26.

21 *WA*, VI, 532.

22 *WML*, III, 20.

23 *WML*, II, 228.

24 *Luther's Works*, American Edition *(LW)*, (Philadelphia, 1955 ff.), XL, 214.

25 *LW*, XL, 146.

be sacrificed for legalism when it comes to externals and ceremonies. "There is to be neither commanding nor forbidding, neither to the right nor to the left. We are neither papistic nor Carlstadtian, but free and Christian."[26] Against Rome, Luther maintained that the sacraments are dependent on the Word; against the *Schwaermer,* he likewise insisted that the Spirit is dependent on the Word. Opposite edges of the same Christ-centered sword are directed against legalistic enemies both to the right and to the left.

5. Concerning current practice, however, are not weekly Communion services often pastorally advisable in meeting the new challenges of twentieth century American church life? Yes.

We are no more bound to imitate what Luther did in medieval Christendom, than Luther felt bound to imitate the example of Christ "unless there is a Word of God present that commands us to do so."[27] As long as we maintain a sharp distinction between administration and reception, there are compelling reasons in many of our parish situations for increasing the frequency of both today. Some of these considerations have been developed persuasively in Sect. F, 1-4 of the statement, "The Sacrament of the Altar," which was adopted by the 1960 Convention of the United Lutheran Church in America as a guide to its congregations.[28] While clearly disavowing the Roman "torso" orientation (F, 2), the U.L.C.A. statement still urges "more frequent and more flexible celebrations of Holy Communion" on grounds of pastoral and congregational need rather than theological or liturgical necessity. For example, "That the Lord's Supper should often be available to each now means in some parishes that it must be available to all each week, for continuity of church attendance is no longer characteristic" (F, 3). This is in harmony with the spirit of Luther, who taught that an evangelical liturgy should be in the service of both God and man.

WILLIAM H. LAZARETH

THE BOSSEY GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ECUMENICAL STUDIES

The Graduate School of Ecumenical Studies of the World Council of Churches at Bossey, near Geneva, has just opened its ninth semester with a subject which perhaps characterizes its work better than any other: "The Christian witness in a post-Christian and non-Christian world." In dealing with such a subject, the Graduate School represents a type of academic institution which resembles neither a normal theological faculty, nor a theological seminary, nor an evangelical academy, but which presupposes the thorough work of a theological faculty or a theological seminary. Organizationally, this is expressed by the fact that the Graduate School is connected with the theological faculty of the University of Geneva, but it is otherwise an independent institute within the university. Students matriculate at the university, and those who have the nec-

26 *LW,* XL, 130.

27 *WA,* XVIII, 114.

28 Full text will be available in the *Minutes of the United Lutheran Church in America,* Twenty-Second Biennial Convention, Atlantic City, New Jersey, 1960.

essary academic qualifications may work toward a doctor's degree in theology with *mention sciences oecuméniques* in addition.

The Graduate School not only presupposes thorough academic studies in theology—or other professional studies, in a few exceptional cases—but it also requires a certain amount of experience in various kinds of church work, a good and critical understanding of the church tradition behind the students, a knowledge of the world in which we live, and an open-mindedness for the encounter with others which will question many of the values hitherto accepted. It is only natural that such qualifications should be required if one wants to see the Graduate School within the whole of the Ecumenical Movement, which has to be understood, first of all, as a movement for the renewal of the churches, a renewal which will also comprise the problem of the manifestation of the one church in a multiplicity of forms of life. In such an institution it is a matter of dealing academically and objectively with the basic questions of renewal which are not presently touched by theological faculties and seminaries, since these do not normally venture so far into applying and exploiting fundamental theoretical perceptions. This state of affairs has to be regarded as deplorable and untenable in the long run. Young people who are not taught how their theoretical knowledge can be exploited —at least partially—will have the greatest difficulty in finding an adequate way of applying it themselves. Very often this search leads them to resignation and an acceptance of the gap existing between theory and practice. In this respect the Graduate School still sees a wide realm of subjects that can be taught. It tries to enter upon this task in its particular ecumenical situation, namely, with a group of about fifty theologians who, in this year's semester, represent twenty-seven countries and twelve denominations.

Subjects of the last few years may illustrate this. We worked on such subjects as "Responsible Use of Power," "The Roman Catholic World," "Ministry and Ministries in the Life and Mission of the Church," and in the semester of 1961-62 we shall probably deal with basic questions concerning the doctrine of man in connection with the subjects for New Delhi.

Of course, it is not an easy task to carry on common studies with a group made up of students at the end of their normal studies, pastors, educators, and professors. The presuppositions of knowledge and of methods for dealing with certain problems, as well as language abilities, vary greatly. On the academic level the attempt has to be made to achieve good cooperation if ecumenics is not to be regarded as a discipline among others but is to be seen in the long run as a dimension of the whole of church life, which also comprises theological work. This cooperation has been successful. We say this after nine years of the existence of the Graduate School, and it grows in depth from year to year as we are able to make a better choice of participants.

Success depends to a decisive extent on an atmosphere among teachers and students which would probably not

nply grow out of objective discussion certain problems. This atmosphere rather a result of an experience of mmon life, which is characterized pecially by our common worship. either in the discussion of questions or in the realm of our worship do we oid differences of traditions and conptions in order to find a quick comomise. If the Ecumenical Movement sound, then it faces the whole variety church traditions which it comises. Here it is probably a good sign we have to admit that in this first ucounter with Christians of other deominations students become much ore conscious of their own tradition an they were before. This awareness mes because they have to represent hat is typical in their denomination, ey have to account for *this* kind of adition and for *this* expression of the aching in their church, they have to ow in how far this teaching is based n Scripture and explain why *these* turgical forms are regarded as sigificant. During the semester each deomination has charge of the daily rvice for two weeks and conducts one unday service, preceded by detailed troductions in order to point out the naracteristics of its church life.

Questions arising from worship are iscussed in a seminar which continues roughout the semester. They may be uestions concerning prayer, concernng the concepts of worship in general nd of Holy Communion in particular, r concerning spiritual discipline mong those who are especially enaged in a life of service to the world. n this life together we have expeenced a growing consciousness of things that Christians of different denominations have in common. These things in common present an excellent basis for discussions, which often call for much patience and also courage to tackle questions which may create tensions—as the race question did in the last semester. This question was quite openly discussed among South Africans of different color and different churches, and it put the student community to a hard test, which it passed.

We do not work with such sentimentalities as would cause one to revel in bliss, be quite happy that everybody is Christian, and then go out to do missionary work with very vague ideas. We are concerned to see differences and agreements at their root and to discover ways of overcoming obstacles to unity—by understanding, for instance, the importance of the non-theological factors which have contributed so much to dividing the churches. Much as we are interested in current problems—since we think that the common task confronting the churches in our time is most likely to lead them together, and that we have to do all we can to understand this common task—we are also deeply concerned, in examining this task, to go back to the sources from which we hope to receive new insights and new courage for revising our traditions. Therefore Bible study, apart from academic exegesis, is very important, and we always endeavor to secure complete involvement of every student, not only in group Bible study but also in the small teams, consisting of different denominations, where he should speak up when it is a matter of ex-

amining more deeply the details of our questions. It is in these groups that ecumenical work in the true sense of the word is done—when one participant has to get acquainted with the other's position and has to accept it as a question addressed to himself, when the group has to put the result of its work before the whole assembly of students so that a topic may be discussed again and a kind of consensus or coordination may be established. Sometimes this leads to a situation where different positions complement one another; at other times we must be content to see the differences as clearly as possible and perhaps just realize in what direction we shall have to move if we are to arrive at the first steps of agreement.

A series of lectures on the history of the Ecumenical Movement is normally part of each semester. Here we make special use of the experience of men who were and still are active in the movement. The work of the semester also includes studying denominations, one or two main ones in each semester, or examining the border line between church and sect, or studying various types of church unions. Finally, students are introduced to various aspects of the World Council's present work by the directors of the different departments in Geneva. Consideration is at the moment being given to the addition of a period of practical work in various realms of church activities after the conclusion of studies at our Graduate School. This would involve sending students perhaps to a working team in North Africa or in Marseille, into refugee work in Austria or Berlin, to an evangelical academy, into an average parish, to industrial work, or even into clearly defined research work. The growth in knowledge and experience which may come from observation and involvement in such work would complete the special kind of education which the Graduate School wants to give, and it would help students to see their future work in an ecumenical perspective.

Of course, there are also disappointments. There is the agonizing experience that differences between churches seem insurmountable in spite of good will and Christian love. But on the whole one may dare to say that, although there are differences in theological language, in interpreting the Bible, in the whole approach to problems of all kinds, many students have left the Graduate School with the knowledge that Christians from different denominations have many beliefs in common. They have learned that readiness to be led to the sources holds the promise for a new relationship among churches which issues concretely not only in new church unions but also in corporate actions of Christians coming from different churches—in spite of differences which still exist.

H. H. Wolf

ook Reviews and Notices[1]

us in the Gospel of Matthew. By Edward P. Blair. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960. 165 pages. $3.00.

This reappraisal of the distinctive features Matthew's Christology by the Kendall fessor of New Testament at Garrett Bibal Institute, Evanston, is motivated by the t that since the discovery of the Qumran its many of the former concepts of Matw's Christology need to be revised.

While it is no doubt true that the Gospels ve been studied more thoroughly than any er writings known to man, the Gospel of atthew, says the author, "has been parularly stubborn in yielding up its secrets" 7). According to Edouard Massaux' care- study, Matthew's Gospel was the most d, most quoted, and most influential New stament writing in the early church up to time of Irenaeus. There is a new flurry interest in the synoptic question today in attempt to get at the historical Jesus.

The author tries to draw as sharply as ssible the character of Matthew's portrait Jesus, to identify and characterize the disctive elements in Matthew's Christology, d to give a more adequate characterization Matthew's view of the way of salvation, ich he says involves knowing, believing, ing, and doing.

In the first chapter major issues in Matean studies are discussed and a survey of cent scholarly treatments of important tical questions is given, such as whether atthew is a primary or a secondary Gospel Mark's priority is sustained), whether it is Jewish-Christian or a Gentile-Christian ospel (the former is defended), and whether is an individual or a community product he latter is affirmed).

The second chapter deals with "The Basis Jesus' Authority," and treats of Jesus as e Messiah (including both the "politicotional" and "religio-spiritual" salvation eas), as the Son of God, and as the Son Man.

The third chapter discusses the authority of Jesus in the realm of knowledge and attributes Jesus' unique religious knowledge to His status as the Messiah, Son of Man, and Son of God.

The fourth chapter deals with the authority of Jesus in the realm of conduct, including his attitude to the oral tradition of the Pharisees and to the written Law. He also discusses Jesus as the second Moses with an extended section on the typological treatment.

The final chapter is the original contribution of the study in which the author gives a summary of Matthew's Christology in these words: "Matthew clearly believes that in Jesus' words God is speaking, in his deeds God is acting, and in his death and resurrection God is rescuing man from his sins. . . . The Gospel of Matthew is not a book of history but a 'gospel,' the 'good news' concerning what God has done and will do in Jesus Christ 'for us men and for our salvation'" (p. 138). He suggests that Matthew's Christology is very similar to that found in the Fourth Gospel and that the two writers came out of the same circle of early Christian thought, represented by the Hellenists of Jerusalem, connected with Stephen, an early leader of the group. Blair does not agree that Matthew "heightened the Christology," as Hoskyns-Davey assume.

In this scholarly work one appreciates the frank discussion of critical and historical questions, the evaluation of many modern writings (including the best on the Qumran literature), the free quotations of rabbinic literature, and the candid disagreement with the views of certain contemporary New Testament scholars. He disagrees radically with B. W. Bacon's idea that the author of Matthew was a converted rabbi and a Christian legalist who wished to furnish the church with an orderly compendium of the command-

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

ments of Jesus, a sort of "new law" modeled after the Pentateuch, which would help stem the tide of antinomianism then threatening to destroy the church (p. 132). He takes issue with Cullmann's idea that the Synoptics present a Messiah-Son of God, and not a Son of Man, Christology (p. 140). He challenges G. Bornkamm's contention that Matthew's Jesus is represented as moving in the orbit of Pharisaic scribalism, accepting basically the validity of Pharisaic tradition, on the one hand, while criticizing the Pharisees' hypocrisy, misuse of tradition, and failure to grasp the heart of the law and the prophets, on the other (p. 141).

The human mind can never fully comprehend the greatness of Jesus. As Vincent Taylor has written, "Jesus will always remain a challenge to be met rather than a problem to be solved." The Gospels are not simply biographies or memoirs; the writers disappear behind their materials in order to focus attention on Jesus Christ. "The Jesus the Gospels disclose is not the Jesus seen by one man or by four men but in a real sense by the whole church" (p. 16). Hence, renewed study in our day of the Gospels and the Synoptic question may in a true sense help us to see the glory of Jesus Christ more fully. This work is a significant contribution to that study.

OLAF K. STORAASLI

The Restoration of Meaning to Contemporary Life. By Paul Elmen. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1958. 194 pages. $3.95.

American theologians are generally not renowned for the lucidity of their literary style. Prof. Elmen appears to be one of those exceptions which prove the rule. The immediately impressive feature of his book is the fact that it is so very well written. But not only is it a readable book—it is worth reading. A careful and erudite analysis of the human situation in our age, it deals at length with the two great threats to our existence, boredom and horror. Meaning is restored though the "glory," God's *Shekinah* and *Doxa* which alone can free us from the all-embracing ennui which so easily turns into a nightmare.

The book is not an original contribution to theology, nor was it intended to be. It is rather a very skilled effort to use the resources of classical and contemporary literature to illustrate the boredom and horror which haunt man. In this effort the years which Prof. Elmen spent as teacher of English at Northwestern University before assuming his present position at Seabury Western Theological Seminary stand him in good stead. The book is extraordinarily useful to the working minister. It is full of suggestions and illustrations for the work that undergirds the sermon. This is by no means the obvious intention but rather the result of the vitality of the literary imagery and example. The writings of Joyce and Kafka, Eliot and Auden, Hemingway and Becket, and many others are examined for the light they shed upon our situation. This is done with great skill and imagination. One example must suffice. After quoting:

> *To and fro the ladies go*
> *Talking of Michelangelo*

he comments, "To the neighbor's inevitable question, 'Is it hot enough for you?' there is one authentic reply: 'All is lost'" (p. 69). The last forty pages of the book which try to describe the possible source for the restoration of meaning, God's glory, are somewhat less convincing than the earlier analysis of boredom and horror. But this only illustrates again that it is always easier to proclaim the Law than the Gospel.

There are a few minor errors which I list for possible removal in future editions. The crucial sentence in Goethe's *Faust* is *"Verweile doch"* (pp. 161 and 162), Volkswagen is misspelled on p. 100 and so is Dreiser on p. 42. Kafka must have written *"Ihm fehlt nichts"* (p. 52). And finally, the introduction of the significance of the "instant" *(Oejenblik)* is a "great swoop" of Kierkegaard's understanding which Heidegger follows but did not discover (p. 179).

GEORGE W. FORELL

Christian Affirmations in a Secular Age. By Giovanni Miegge. New York: Oxford University Press, 1958. 170 pages. $3.75.

Giovanni Miegge, professor of New Tes-

ent at the Waldensian theological faculty Rome, is known in the English-speaking ld through his fine book on the Virgin ry. Here, in a book successfully trans- d by Bishop Stephen Neill, he offers a ussion of the great themes of the Chris- faith, "directed by the constant desire to forget and not to underestimate, the blems and difficulties of contemporary man at contemporary man in whom each one is must recognize himself" (p. xiii).

The themes selected range from the "Prob- of God" through various Christological erns to a discussion of immortality and rrection. All this is done in a most wledgeable manner and the book furnishes competent introduction to the theological ussion of our time.

This reviewer, however, had some difficulty ualizing the audience for which the book written. It seems too difficult for the lay- n and too superficial for the theologian. the one it assumes too much, for the r it says too little. There is also an oying habit of taking both sides on issues ch, as far as this reader is concerned, do permit such a stance. For example, proofs the existence of God are defended and cked and Prof. Miegge, aware of the temporary discussion, seems to come out avor of both the immortality of the soul the resurrection of the body. He says, seems wise then to hold on to the values tained in both these ideas, resurrection immortality, allowing them mutually to it and correct one another" (p. 165).

The influence of Karl Barth is pronounced, cially in the discussion of the "Lordship Christ" where the customary Barthian fusion of Law and Gospel is reproduced, it without the selfconsciousness of the man Barthians.

Perhaps the key to a certain feeling of ir- tion which the book produced in this der can be found in one sentence on page . "As is generally true of the problems religion, it is the axiological approach ich is the most suggestive and the most tful." If I understand this sentence cor- ly it means that theological questions ht to be decided on the basis of philo- hical, specifically ethical criteria. As far as the Christian faith is concerned, this statement simply will not do.

GEORGE W. FORELL

Language, Logic and God. By Frederick Ferré. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961. 184 pages. $3.50.

One of the most interesting developments on the contemporary theological scene has been the encounter of analytic philosophy with theology. Analytic philosophy has been concerned about the clarification of language and, from time to time, it has come to grips with religious language. From a philosophical point of view, religious language often appears to suffer from ambiguity. At the same time, this language plays such an important role in human existence as to suggest that it is a significant form of expression in spite of apparent confusion. Some of the more radical analysts went so far as to claim that religious language was meaningless because its basis in experience could not be clearly shown. Recently other analytical philosophers have taken a more charitable approach and allowed the theologians to attempt to explain just how religious language does function, how it is related to experience, and what rules govern its behavior. This more temperate attitude on the part of analytic philosophy has resulted in a serious conversation about the meaning and use of religious language. This conversation has taken place mainly in Great Britain, but its importance and influence are not limited to that country. It is this dialogue between modern, linguistically oriented, empirical philosophy and theology that Dr. Ferré has chosen as the subject of his first book. It is a timely topic, since there has been no prior comprehensive survey of this important development.

The dialogue between philosophy and theology has been difficult to grasp because of the technical nature of the philosophical approach to language and because the discussions have only been available in scattered journals and collections of essays. Most of these contributions were intended to deal with specific issues and there has been a real need for a work that would put these issues

in perspective. Also, many colleges and seminaries had begun to study this aspect of theological development and a guide to the conversation was a vital necessity. Dr. Ferré has provided such a work of uniformly excellent quality which presents in a few hours' reading insights and information about a rather specialized area of theology. He has put the issues and positions in a helpful framework where they become clear and intelligible. The technical aspects of logic and philosophical analysis have been handled in such a manner as to make them quite easily understood. The complexities and diverse threads of the discussion are well organized and allow a general appreciation of broad trends and patterns.

Ferré does not accept the contentions of modern philosophy at the expense of perverting religious convictions. At the same time, he attempts to view sympathetically the concerns of philosophy as they relate to the religious use of language. It is certainly important to the theologians that religious language be as clear as possible, and any insights that philosophy can offer Ferré tries to recognize. Although the book is primarily an account of what other scholars have said and are saying, Ferré also makes an attempt to point to a solution of the issues between analytic philosophy and theology. His solution is one that demands clarification on the side of theology as well as qualification of some of the demands of philosophy. The volume is important not so much for the solutions offered but for the broad and complete account of the entire discussion.

This is not a sermon builder nor a book of inspiration. It is a serious report of a significant discussion of a current theological issue. For all those who are interested in understanding the implications of religious language it is a worthwhile study. Perhaps at this point we Lutherans should have a special interest because of our concern for pure doctrine framed in language. We certainly ought to be concerned about the nature of this doctrinal language and the contemporary efforts to understand its function. It may be a disturbing task to follow this discussion of religious language, but it would seem essential that we know as much a possible about the capabilities and limitatio of language if we are to be honest in ou profession and proclamation of the faith.

LYMAN LUNDEE

Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peac
By Roland H. Bainton. Nashville: A ingdon Press, 1960. 300 pages. $4.75.

Professor Bainton, Titus Street professo of ecclesiastical history at Yale Divini School, is perhaps best known for his awar winning biography of Martin Luther, *He I Stand,* but he is also the author of an in pressive list of books and articles over t years. The jacket on the book describes Pr fessor Bainton as an active member of t Society of Friends and makes mention of h ordination as a Congregationalist minist *Who's Who* lists him as a Congregationali an educator and a church historian.

"The ethical problems of war and pea cry urgently for re-examination" and Pr fessor Bainton provides such a re-examin tion. As a historian he is profoundly co cerned over international behavior whic threatens to bring an end to history.

The approach is that of the historical su vey which begins with the ideals of peace antiquity and continues through the atom era. He finds that "three attitudes to war a peace were to appear in the Christian ethi pacifism, the just war, and the crusade" (14) and that chronologically they emerg in just that order. These three views, a they are all Christian views, "had alrea taken shape before the close of the Midd Ages" and "thereafter they were to r appear in various configurations" (p. 15).

The bibliographic apparatus is indeed i pressive. References in Latin, German a French are included as well as citations fr people with diverse points of view—fr Kennan and Kissinger to Vera Brittain a Harry Emerson Fosdick.

In the last two chapters Professor Baint takes the personal position of the Christi pacifist and rejects both the crusade and t just war. For Lutherans acquainted with t just war concept in the Augsburg Confessi it is of interest to note that Professor Baint

plies that a just war now is not possible. Every part was interesting, especially the apters on "The Origins of the Crusading ea in the Old Testament" and "War and ace in the New Testament." The gentle t hearty spirit of the persistent Quaker emed to glow through the early parts of e book. The last two chapters of the his- rical survey covering the period from aterloo to the present plus the two chap- rs of his own analysis do not maintain the andards of objectivity set earlier in the lume. The list of illustrations is heavily aded with cartoons calculated to show the sillusionment and catastrophe created by ar, none to show the tragedy of injustice d oppression.

In the area of recent history there are so any errors and distortions that this re- ewer is moved to despair. On page 200 the aim that "Spain had conceded our demands" 1898 is open to question; it is patently false at "President McKinley declared war." n page 214 Professor Bainton refers to a ur-power treaty which was quite different om the one he describes. Whereas present storians of American diplomacy (Bemis nd Bailey) refer to the treaties of this Washington Conference as "a face saving treat" and judge that the "achievements . . proved to be temporary and somewhat lusory," Professor Bainton states that the United States gained heavily." On political nd military events Professor Bainton relies eavily on documents which fit his case, takes o little account of the more reputable urces. His analysis of positions taken by hurchmen and organized churches represents real contribution.

I am glad that this book was written. It is part of the growing body of literature on hristian responsibility. It sharpens the edge f debate. It presents a clear testimony by mature religious scholar of a major prob- m of our times.

DONIVER A. LUND

Three Paths of God and Man. By Samuel H. Dresner. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960. 127 pages. $3.00.

Rabbi Dresner serves Congregation Beth El in Springfield, Massachusetts, and edits the journal *Conservative Judaism.* Therefore, one does not look here for the path from man to God or from God to man to lead through Christ. It is a solid and worthy exposition and application of Old Testament teachings.

The author posits a personal God. "Not the remote, aloof God of the philosophers. . . . Who cares little for man and his concerns, but the God of our father: the God Who discovered Abraham in Ur of the Chaldees and tried him at Moriah . . ." (page 13). His thesis runs as follows: "Among the ways in which God enters the life of man are: *prayer* [in relation to heaven], *humility* [in relation to himself], and *compassion* [in relation to his fellow man]" (p. 14—The bracketed phrases are inserted from elsewhere in the book).

There are a great many pithy sayings and many fresh sermon illustrations which are as suitable for the Christian preacher as for the rabbi. In connection with the topic of prayer an appropriate use of Psalm references is made. The influence of science and materialism upon modern man's likelihood to use prayer is well discussed. He describes in a clear way the stark lack of compassion in our twentieth century not only on the part of the dread dictators but also of the common man. He diagnoses well the spiritual impoverishment of modern man.

There is good balance and perspective and a pleasant style of writing. It would be refreshing for a Lutheran pastor to share this man's thoughts even though he will be constantly reminded of the words of Jesus that are missing in this treatment of prayer, humility, and compassion.

DAVID BELGUM

The Forgiveness of Sins. By William Telfer. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960. 154 pages. $2.75.

This book originated as lectures to the Student Christian Movement which were later also delivered to several groups of clergymen. The author was formerly Ely Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

Beginning with the biblical doctrine of

forgiveness, the author traces the manner in which the church has viewed this doctrine through the centuries and the specific ministrations and practices the church has used to try to make this doctrine applicable to individual persons. Second Repentance was one of the early approaches whereby a Christian could be reconciled to the church and readmitted to the Lord's Supper if he had sinned after his Baptism. ". . . Tertullian here sets before us an established form of public entry upon 'Second Repentance,' to which he gives the Greek name of *exomologesis* (confession) . . . emphasizing the . . . enormity of post-baptismal sin" (page 48). There was only one opportunity for such restoration.

Later the church began to be influenced by social and cultural factors: the conversion of Emperor Constantine, the rapid influx of converts to the church in North Africa, the need for encouragement as well as discipline during the Roman persecutions, etc. In connection with the persecutions it was assumed to be especially effectual for a sinner to make confession to a martyr and "the notion of the Church as 'an ark to save the perishing' was gaining over the notion of the congregation of saints . . . everyone regarded the claim of the Church to release men from the guilt of sins as her most characteristic and fundamental claim" (pp. 77 f.). Penance was viewed in the fourth century as a means forwarding the holiness of the Church.

The author traces the transition from public confession (in connection with "Second Repentance") to private confession, individual absolution, and the assignment of "the penance appropriate to the offence thus secretly confessed." Throughout this scholarly work there is ample documentation of the author's interpretation of church history. The church fathers and chief theologians of each generation are cited to show their influence on either theory or practice. One has the feeling that the position of each one is fairly and sympathetically stated. This objectivity is frequently lacking when such controversial issues are dealt with. The author shows why certain trends and emphases developed, e.g., the "Western Church was engaged in a battle, that lasted throughout the Middle Ages, to gain and keep her hold over socie in the young nations of Europe." The si nificant and strategic leaders are given the place: Clement, Tertullian, Pelagius, Augu tine, Thomas Aquinas, Peter Lombard, L ther, Calvin, and Richard Hooker, to mentio only a few. In fact, it would be difficult name one who had been missed. In h Epilogue the author indicates his own som what eclectic appreciation for the vario emphases. "And we therefore do nothi amiss in seeking a doctrine of forgivene that is at once Catholic and Reforme (p. 147).

In connection with an appreciation Luther's contribution, the author raises tw criticisms: (1) "What we most miss in th Lutheran treatment of repentance is a reference to a resolve, on the part of th penitent, to sin no more. The reason is tha Luther had an almost morbid fear of huma presumption in quest of virtue. . . . This fea was not rational" (p. 113). (2) "Thu against such an ecclesiastical transaction a the so-called Sacrament of Penance, th Augsburg Confession made canonical th Lutheran 'evangelical experience' ('We kno ourselves forgiven when we believe ourselve the objects of the divine favour in Christ' and so asserted something that was in dange of becoming subjective, unless all weigh were thrown upon the abiding word of Scrip ture" (p. 116). The author correctly state that Luther approved of and counted on th confessional, but that it "has not, in fac kept its place in Lutheran practice."

The reader will be richly rewarded by slow reading of this thorough book. It woul be salutary if we would reconsider all ou major doctrines in such an ecumenical fram of reference and from such a careful dis section of the historical factors that oftc becloud the issues. Highly recommende reading for pastors.

DAVID BELGUM

Soul and Psyche. By Victor White. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960. 31 pages. $5.00.

The day may well never come when w can clearly discern the form or the workin

man's inwardness for the very nature of s inwardness does not show itself to instru- nts that measure or weigh or photograph. t we continue to pursue our quest into as uch depth as is discoverable to an empirical ethod and we are grateful to those who are lving in to map out the territory where the pirit does His unseen work. Victor White his *Soul and Psyche* deserves special atitude for leading us a bit further on the ay to a closer understanding between ristian theology and depth psychology, sciplines that seem to have made for a alism in which the clergy works in the ecial domain of the soul and the psychia- st in the domain of the psyche.

The author, who is a member of the ominican Order, Professor of Theology at Blackfriars, Oxford University, and Foun- tion member at the C. G. Jung Institute Analytical Psychology, sees man in his holeness, where there is no mutual ex- usiveness, and thus holds to the theme that ul and psyche are one. If religion and ychology see their domains as separate nd distinct from each other, they both must rrender any claim to deal with the whole man being or any concern with total per- onal integration. There is therefore a com- on ground between religion and psychology.

The treatment as a whole is "an enquiry nto the relationship of psychiatry and re- gion." The Jungian concepts are analyzed or their contribution to the understanding of ne religious, especially according to Thomis- c theology. There can be a limited accept- nce of these contributions for they arise nly out of empirical observation. And re- gion makes its contribution to the under- tanding of psychiatry. Common ideas of the wo fields, symbol and dogma, trinity and uaternity, health and holiness, and others, re closely examined to bring illumination nd perspective. Christian theologians can- ot concur all the way with the analysis, nor ill the psychiatrist, but they will find them- elves further along the way for having ollowed this enquiry.

PAUL M. LINDBERG

The Day of Light. By H. B. Porter. Greenwich, Connecticut: Seabury Press, 1960. 86 pages. $1.75.

The Baptismal Sacrifice. By George Every. London: SCM Press, 1959. 112 pages. 9/6d.

These two paperbacks belong to a series of "Studies in Ministry and Worship," an Anglican project under the editorship of G. W. H. Lampe and David M. Paton. The general purpose of the series is to vitalize the worship and the witness of the church in the context of biblical theology, the liturgical movement and ecumenical concern.

The first two features of this setting are specifically present in Porter's book, a study of the biblical and liturgical meaning of Sunday. The biblical significance of the Lord's day is based upon the fact that it is at once the first day of creation, the day of Christ's resurrection and the day of the bestowal of the Spirit. Far from being anything fortuitous or arbitrary, it is inextricably bound up with the basic affirmations of the threefold Christian creed. An informative sketch is given of the history of Sunday worship and of the liturgical rites associated with Sunday. The attempt to impose biblical Sabbath regulations on the Lord's day is seen to be a perversion of the gospel. But unlike Luther's stress on the preaching and hearing of the Word, the emphasis here is on traditional eucharistic worship. The author is an American Episcopalian who teaches ecclesiastical history at Nashotah House, Nashotah, Wisconsin.

In Every's book the liturgical point of view is predominant. As in primitive initiation ordeals, the central motif in Christian baptism is the sacrifice and burial of the old life and the resurrection into the new. The author probes carefully the early Christian baptismal rite, with special attention to the description given by Justin Martyr and Hippolytus. But he is interested in other initiations too, such as the rites of marriage and coronation, and he devotes as much attention to the eucharist as to baptism. Indeed it is his contention that the two gospel sacraments must be seen in close integration as essentially interdependent parts of one divine action. This author, a

high church Anglican with an ecumenical interest, is connected with the Society of the Sacred Mission, Kelham.

Both books fulfill admirably the aim of the series to provide a forum of discussion of issues vital to the life of the church "on a scale between the article in the journal and the major theological treatise." They are crisp and readable without sacrificing scholarship. They evoke a *pium desiderium* that more similar works might be written from a point of view in which the gospel itself rather than its traditional rendition would play the decisive role.

T. A. KANTONEN

The Purpose and Work of the Ministry. By Gabriel J. Fackre. Philadelphia: Christian Education Press, 1959. 141 pages. $2.50.

The first impression this book leaves with the reader is that the author is a pastor who knows who he is and what he ought to be doing and is doing it. He has given much study, thought and analysis to all aspects of life and the pastoral ministry today. Instead of bewailing bitterly the complexity of his course, he has worked out satisfactory approaches to the problems encountered. In this little volume there is good balance between the purpose and the work of the Christian ministry today.

Aimed particularly at the home mission work of the Protestant Churches of contemporary America, what is said has pertinence for all types of parish situations. The book has emerged from years of experience with inner city and industrial types of mission work. The author stresses that "the mission ministry is by no means limited to the mushrooming new suburbias. It reaches well into other nooks and crannies of need created by our present sociological posture. . . ." An accurate picture is given of how clearly conceived, theologically oriented, as well as efficiently organized and administered, the special mission pastorate must be.

Although the setting and work of the home mission ministry are expounded under chapter titles such as The River, The Boat and Its Oarsmen, The Strokes, The Rapids, and The Riverbank, the approach is no allegorical but scholarly and orthodox. Ob servation and experience in the parish min istry make their contribution to the treatise too.

Some Lutherans might wish to plac preaching in a higher position on the list o duties of the pastor but the author place this office where he does simply because hi arrangement of the pastor's work is base on the mission pastorate and its specia situation.

The last chapter in the book contains th results to date of the Milltown Community an experiment by the congregations in th parish served by Pastor Fackre and his staff which incorporates some of the ideas of th Iona Community of Scotland and provides a place of retreat for the members of th community. Restoration of the property, re juvenation and recreation combine with wor ship in this endeavor. The enterprise is in teresting and unique, with individual owner ship of the land and summer cabins in th community. One does question, however, th author's premise that a pastor ought t spend his vacation period with his people— and the people theirs with him. This is par of the basic philosophy of the Milltow Community.

This "study in self-understanding," as th writer catalogues his work, should aid ever pastor to evaluate and, perhaps, reorder hi parish ministry, wherever it may be.

GEORGE M. BAS

The Human Problems of the Minister. B Daniel D. Walker. New York: Harpe & Brothers, 1960. 196 pages. $3.95.

Ministers in general are often said to b hiding behind a protective covering donne simultaneously with the putting on of th backward collar. And once safely behind th shelter they are reluctant to come out to ex pose themselves as human beings with all o the weaknesses and foibles so glaringly evi dent in the pews to which they preach. Woul that they would come out more often an expose themselves as human, at least to som trusted and understanding friend who coul

rage in plain talk and help in self-analysis. would be good for the pastor's inner self well as for his sense of outward security the position he holds before men. The re- al to see himself as human, perhaps be- se he feels the necessity to live up to the ular image of the clergy as a distinct and y cast, is one of the great sins of the rgy.

For those who do not have a confidant dily available to whom they can safely rust their inner selves, or to those who 't recognize the presence of a potential fidant, this little book offers a way out. quiet corner would be a good place to e the dialogue offered through the printed ges of the volume. The pastor's responses ght be something like the following: "Who d you about me and my sins?" "Now you getting to the real me." "I hope my ple don't hear what you are saying." ou even make me laugh at myself more n a little bit." "Thanks for talking to me. has done me a lot of good."

At least such ought to be some of the sponses to an author who can talk about r being 'condemned to sin piously,' or our ruggle to love our enemies,' or the 'dis- lined disorder,' and other problems that easily beset the man of the cloth. Dr. alker is all the more acceptable because is a pastor who knows firsthand whereof speaks and understands the more sig- ficant dimensions of the work and life of e clergy.

PAUL M. LINDBERG

e Call This Friday Good. By Howard G. Hageman. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961. 83 pages. $1.50.

Any preacher who has trembled at the sk of preaching on the seven last words of r Lord appreciates the difficulties involved the preparation of a volume of sermons on ese words. Dr. Hageman, cognizant that nother series of meditations on the seven st words would seem to require a real ex- se for being" has overcome his own ob- ction. These sermons need no apology for eir existence as literature; they are indeed mulating to the reader who contemplates the meaning of the Cross in the seven last words.

Freshness in homiletical production is a problem that pursues every preacher of the Word. This specter haunts him constantly as he prepares to preach to his flock. Some interpreters will resort to subtle devices to insure freshness and vitality in their sermons, ignoring the principles of hermeneutics and exposition. Not so with this author. He searches the Scriptures and surmounts this difficulty through the insights he has gained from these words. In one meditation he observes, "There is about Calvary a rugged honesty that cannot fail to impress" and the writer incorporates impressively this same quality into the messages he pens. Using texts among the most familiar to Christians, his efforts result in "Words of sparkling power, Of insight full and deep."

The meditations, written from the perspective which Easter and the intervening years give, keep the Cross in focus while turning the words of our Lord toward the questions and needs of people today. This Cross is no sentimental symbol, silhouetted on the sinful stage of some long-forgotten age; rather, it is planted solidly in the society of people living in the Space Age, so that the Atonement is seen lucidly as an historical event with eternal implications. Once more, vividly and in reality, it is the Son of God speaking words of life to a languishing world even as he dies. The very mind and heart of the Lord, laid bare as the words are spoken again, convey his concern for the completion of his mission and his deep compassion for his children.

The author involves his readers in the events of Good Friday by using a graphic method of interpretation which intersperses exposition and application as each sermon unfolds. Speculation and bland guesswork find no sympathy with the one who studies and struggles to understand the words of his Master and Saviour. Because it is the real message of the true Lord that is spoken, even the reticent reader is drawn into a fuller and deeper appreciation of the mysteries of this most memorable day.

The harassed pastor seeking help for his pulpit ventures will find here no simple ser-

mon outlines nor will he discover a new supply of illustrations to fill the gaps in his thinking. Since the illustrative material includes relatively few anecdotes but many brief two or three sentence illustrations, some story seekers will be disappointed. But the careful reader will have the greater reward of being stimulated by the perceptive thought of the writer. These are sermons that will make preachers think about their Lord, his Passion and Death, and what the Cross should mean to people today.

Lutheran pastors in particular should welcome these meditations by a Reformed brother-pastor, and will be richer, personally and as preachers, for reading and even studying them.

GEORGE M. BASS

Thomasius Old Testament Selections. By M. Reu. Translated by Max L. Steuer. Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press. 704 pages. $6.75.

Anyone who knew or heard Dr. M. Reu would be familiar with the very thorough character of all of his work. This trait was not developed as a seminary professor; it had been a part of his character long before. It is no surprise, therefore, to find that while he was pastor in Rock Falls, Illinois, he carefully accumulated the materials for a two-volume work on the Thomasius Old Testament selections. These volumes, published in 1901 and 1903 in German, have now been translated into English in slightly condensed form.

For each text Reu provides an exegetical interpretation of about four or five pages, a homiletical adaptation of approximately three or four pages, and usually six to ten "main point outlines."

These studies are intended to be background material, not sermons, and as such may give real help to many preachers, especially in view of what appears to be an increased interest in Old Testament texts. They contain sound exegetical help and also have a pastor's practical touch.

ARTHUR O. ARNOLD

Fulfill Thy Ministry. By Herbert Berner. St Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House 1959. 46 pages. $.75.

This little booklet contains one of th series of lectures on preaching endowed b the late Rev. J. Frederick Wenchel whic are delivered annually at Concordia Semi nary, St. Louis, and this year also at Con cordia Seminary in Springfield, Illinois.

The lectures are presented under three general headings: Our Attitude Toward Preaching, The Aim, and The Qualifications The aim of preaching is developed under th four concepts of education, stewardship, evan gelization and conservation. The qualifica tions are listed as manliness, honest work manship, faith, humility and love.

The pastor reading these pages will find very little that is new and very little that is said in any particularly new way but he will find many old things that need to be said again. The book is not concerned with the mechanics of preaching but with the pastoral attitudes so necessary to an effective gospel ministry. We pastors should let someone say these things to us from time to time.

ARTHUR O. ARNOLD

Handbook of Church Finance. By David R. Holt, II. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960. 201 pages. $5.00.

It seems that in our stewardship-conscious times we do not weary of looking for new helps in successful church financing. Here is another volume to be added to the practical shelf. It is decidedly in the category of "helps for the harried pastor," and should serve to ease a bit of the strain in the how-to-do-it area of his concerns. The virtue of this book is that it comes from a layman who has sought out the experiences of some one thousand churches that have faced the problem in a very real way. Combining proven business principles with the findings of his survey he has come up with a readable handbook for ordained and lay leaders who have the responsibility of gathering, caring for, apportioning and investing church funds.

PAUL M. LINDBERG